THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1933. Vol. XXIII.

UNCTION FOR THE SICK

By The Editor.

ON May 31, the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury received the Report of the Joint Committee on Unction and Laying on of Hands.

The House, with two dissentients (the Bishop of Birmingham and the Bishop of St. Edmundsbury), gave a general approval to the proposed services of Unction and the Laying on of Hands, or for the Laying on of Hands without Unction, and referred the details as to the forms and words of the services to a committee comprising the Bishops of Rochester, Winchester, Norwich, Truro and Portsmouth.

In opposing the reception of the Report, the Bishop of Birmingham said, as reported by the *Times* (June 1),

> that he could not accept the principle, suggestion, or implication that oil which was blessed by a priest or a bishop thereby received healing properties. Any attempt to revive the primitive use of unction would lead, at any rate, some ill-educated people to believe that holy oil was of curative value. If the report received official approval they would have taken a retrograde step towards religious barbarism. The practice of imposition of hands on the sick tended to obscure the true character of prayer.

The Bishop of St. Edmundsbury deprecated the proposed practice as superstitious, and asked, in cases of sickness, what more, from the religious point of view, did they need than faithful prayer?

Although a large majority of our English bishops appear to favour the re-introduction into our Church life of the anointing of the sick with consecrated oil, we view the whole proposal with extreme apprehension. We do not forget, of course, that St. James in his *Epistle* (v, 14) advocates prayer and anointing with oil in the name of the Lord by the elders of the Church in cases of sickness, and that the apostles are narrated to have anointed the sick with oil as a means to their recovery. But shall we be well advised to re-introduce into our Church life customs which were deliberately abandoned at the Reformation? The great Fathers of the English Reformation had all practised this rite. They had had a long experience of its effects both physical and spiritual, yet they definitely excluded it from Church practice. It may be argued that they had no right to prohibit a New Testament practice, and that on that ground alone our bishops are entirely justified in restoring the practice to-day. Do our bishops then propose to restore the practice of exorcizing evil spirits, for this also was an apostolic practice, and it also was definitely excluded by the English Reformers from the services of the Church.[1] The Reformers were satisfied with the Prayer of Faith, and we cannot but feel that we should do well not to fall back from what must have been for them a decision as revolutionary as it was unpopular. We know that besides the argument from apostolic practice there is the argument from the usage of the Latin and Greek Churches; they make use of Unction with consecrated oil. But to continue a practice is quite a different thing from re-introducing it into Church life after it has been definitely abandoned for several centuries. It is true the re-introduction of the practice would bring us nearer to the Greek and Latin Churches, but it would also separate us very decisively from large numbers of our fellow-countrymen, who would view the practice as superstitious and reactionary. Those English Church people—and they are a very minute proportion—who desire in the case of sickness to be anointed with consecrated oil can no doubt secure such anointing, as a number of our clergy already practise the use of Unction. We cannot safely argue from the

[1] Exorcism was retained at Baptism in the First Prayer Book of King Edward VI (1549 A.D.) but excluded in the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI (1552 A.D.), and this was also the case with Unction.

practice of the Latin and Greek Churches that the use of sacred oil has the whole-hearted support of the more intelligent clergy and laity of those communions. Where a thing of this sort is the immemorial custom and has canonical authority behind it, disciplined clergy and practising laity acquiesce and say nothing—except on rare occasions in private. It was the Abbé Duchesne who, having had explained to him clearly by an able Anglo-Catholic the ideals and aims of that movement, exclaimed :

> 'Ah! I see you wish to introduce into your Church many things which we wish to get rid of in ours.'

It is the misfortune of our bishops only to hear the pleadings of those who desire to promote the 'Catholicizing' of the English Church. They seem to be quite unaware of the contemptuous condemnations of that policy. The proposal to restore the use of Unction will seem to a vast body of the English public to be but one more proof of the materialistic sacramentalism and the sacerdotal fatuity which is securing an increasing hold on the diminishing membership of the English Church. And it is this growing feeling which accounts in no small measure for the steady but silent desertion of her churches.

Broadly speaking, there are two ways which our Church may tread—the one leading to closer approximation to traditionalist doctrine and practice. But in treading this path the English Church will find herself beaten at every point by her increasingly formidable competitor, the Church of Rome in this land. As Father Bernard Vaughan said, speaking of the effectiveness of his Church's activities in this sphere, 'The Catholic Church is delivering the goods all the while, and there is no doubt as to their genuineness.' There must always be the underlying doubt in the minds of those in the English Church who desire the 'goods' of this kind as to whether they are not inferior in quality to those which the Church of Rome can supply. For ourselves, if we want the 'goods' of sacerdotal sacramentalism, we know where to get it, but, like the vast majority of our fellow-countrymen, we do not want these 'goods' at all, and it gives us pain to think of our Church offering to bestow them.

The other road open to the Church of England which our English Reformers set out to tread was one in which the pilgrims definitely turned their backs on materialistic sacramental-

ism and sacerdotal claims. They sought to tread that hard and narrow road which runs between the bogs of superstition and the precipices of scepticism. This path of a rational, moral and spiritual religion is always a difficult path to tread, for although it leads us away from the old error into the growing apprehension of truth, yet the eyes of the traveller are often dazzled by the false lights of new errors even more seductive than the old. A striking characteristic of our age is the revolt from rationalism in the name of psychology, and as a consequence the recrudescence of superstition and the even more alarming increase of scepticism, for the two in the history of religion ever go hand in hand.

We know to-day something of the solid gifts of medical science — the immense improvement in public health; the increase in the average length of life; the marvels of surgery; the unspeakable benefits conferred by the use of anaesthetics and antiseptics; the comforts of hygienic nursing. What has the magic and miracle of Lourdes and similar centres to set against this? We do not deny, for scientific investigation affirms it, that faith can lead to the cure or improvement in health of many who are sick, but that faith is not dependent upon material aids such as shrines, Unction, relics, manual acts.

It is *the* miracle in what are called our Lord's miracles of healing that, according to the testimony of our most ancient literary evidence, He never claimed to heal anyone. In an age and country where medical science was almost unknown, and exorcism and magic combined with crude surgery sought to cure the ills which human flesh is heir to, Jesus Christ said to those who would worship Him as their healer, 'Thy faith hath made thee whole.' That faith is still valid for the same purpose to-day, but it stands in no need of superstitious accessories to assist its operation. When the Prayer of Faith (uttered or unuttered) is made to depend on the irrational use of material objects it becomes sub-Christian and sub-scientific.

The road to Ekron (like the road to Endor) is a very old road, and of course human beings will continue to tread it when crazed by pain and terror, but it is the undoubted duty of the bishops of the Christian Church to point such victims of superstitious temptation to that higher road which is revealed to us

by the example of Christ and by the teaching of that Spirit of Truth which would lead us *Ex umbris et imaginibus in lucem.*

Dr. Henson produced in 1925 *Notes on Spiritual Healing.* Nothing better in its way has been written on this theme for intelligent English readers. It not only sets forth the Bishop's own convictions with that acumen, lucidity and trenchancy to which we are accustomed, but it contains also a very important collection of *data.* In that volume the Bishop writes :

> ' Sick rooms are the breeding-places of superstition, as marshes are of the mosquitoes which carry malaria ; and the worst developments of that spiritual malady which is known as ' sacerdotalism ' are connected directly with the frailty and fears of invalids ' (p. xxiii).
>
> ' Beyond all doubt any general reversion to the primitive confusion of medicine and theurgic religion would be an immense misfortune to mankind ' (p. xxxii).
>
> ' Healing has played a great part in the history of religion. Disease has been closely associated with sin, and its treatment has passed almost inevitably into the hands of those who are connected with moral issues. Disease, moreover, has never been absent from human experience, and the desire to be released from it has always been a powerful sentiment in human minds. The mystery which attaches to its onset, and to its departure, has ever turned men's minds towards supernatural powers. Disease has been interpreted religiously, and the cure of disease has been held to express Divine activity. The favourites of heaven have been credited with healing power ; and the scenes of their death and burial have absorbed and perpetuated their distinctive grace. Miraculous healing is part of the tradition of Christendom, and the *amour propre* of the Christian Church is bound up with its defence.
>
> None the less, Christianity stands to lose by its association with miraculous healing. Historically this has been the door through which superstition has found its easiest entrance into the Church. Nor is this to be marvelled at. For miraculous healing is not a Christian phenomenon. It has for Christians no religious significance ' (p. 7).
>
> ' While the ignorant Greeks of the Levant, besotted with primitive superstition, are thus beginning to turn from their healing shrines to the light of medical science, it would seem that the opposite process is observable among ourselves. The more ecclesiastically-minded advocates of spiritual healing would reverse the movement of history, restore the long-abandoned cultus of the saints, and gather again about their ruined shrines the multitudes of afflicted folk. Psycho-therapy, decked out with medieval ceremonial, and grounded on sacramental theory, shall recover for the Church, purged at last of Protestant heresy, the prestige and popularity which it has lacked so long ! ' (p. 13).

In Chapter viii, which deals with the Unction of the sick, Dr. Henson writes :

> ' Everything was anointed in the Primitive Church, for everything might give harbourage to the demons who pervaded the world. What

"germs" and "bacilli" are to the modern Christian, that demons were to his primitive or medieval predecessor. Churches, altars, sacred vessels and furniture, bells—all received solemn unction with appropriate formulae. And, of course, the sick were anointed also. In their case probably there was a mingling of allied notions. Oil was extensively used among the ancients for physical healing. Disease was in the ancient mind intimately connected with demonic activity. Oil was therefore both a medicine and a charm, and in either character it was obviously relevant to a sick Christian's condition' (p. 155).

'We possess the "Prayer Book" of Bishop Sarapion, the friend and correspondent of St. Athanasius, "an Egyptian Pontifical, dated probably about A.D. 350-356," as it is described on the title-page of the convenient edition published by S.P.C.K. It includes the following "prayer in regard to oil for the sick or for bread or for water," which deserves the careful consideration of those who would revive the ancient practice of anointing the sick. Can they restore the mentality which this prayer discloses?

"We invoke thee who hath all authority and power, the Saviour of all men, Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and pray thee to send healing power of the only-begotten from heaven with this oil, that it may become to those who are being anointed (with it), or are partaking of these thy creatures, for a throwing off of every sickness and every infirmity, *for a charm against every demon, for a separation of every unclean spirit, for an expulsion of every evil spirit,* for a driving out of all fever and ague, and every infirmity, for good grace and remission of sins, for a medicine of life and salvation, for health and soundness of soul, body, spirit, for perfect strengthening. *O Master, let every Satanic energy, every demon, every device of the adversary, every plague, every scourge, every pain, every labour or stroke or shaking or evil shadowing, fear thy holy name which we have now invoked* and the name of the only-begotten; and let them depart from the inward (and) the outward parts of these thy servants, that his name may be glorified who for us was crucified and rose again, who took up our sicknesses and our infirmities, (even) Jesus Christ, and who is coming to judge quick and dead. Because through him to thee (is) the glory and the strength in Holy Spirit both now and to all the ages of the ages. Amen."' (p. 157).

Dr. Henson contributes a very important note on the use of consecrated oils which certainly deserves the serious consideration of every English bishop who voted in Convocation for the re-introduction of these oils into our English Church practice:

'The spiritual potency of oil was acquired by episcopal or priestly consecration, or by contact with the person of a saint, or by ecclesiastical use, or by association with sacred places. The uses to which the holy oil might be applied were as various as the sources from which its efficacy was derived. Animals anointed with it were proof against the cattle-plague, and St. Chrysostom recommended the anointing of the body with oil taken from the martyrs' tombs as a remedy against drunkenness. To this day the Nestorian Christians mix oil, water, and the relics of some saint, or, if these are not to be procured, dust from the scene of a martyrdom, and anoint the sick with the mixture.

> In the case of the sick, however, there was, behind the mountainous development of crass superstition, the respectable authority of the apostolic precedent . . .' (p. 158).

But, as Dr. Henson rightly points out, there is no reason for thinking that our Lord ever used oil in His work of healing. But, we may ask, even if He did, would that necessarily be a reason for using oil to-day in this way? If we accept the Gospel texts as historically sound, Jesus used saliva mixed with clay for healing purposes. Would our Church authorities advocate this practice in the sick room to-day?

If Unction be used sacramentally for healing, it will no doubt include in time its use for the remission of sins, which our English Reformers, ahead of rather than behind their age, declared in the Articles to be 'the corrupt following of the Apostles.' Dr. Henson aserts that:

> 'Those who advocate the revival of the primitive unction of the sick are but calling the modern Church to traverse again, and under still more unfavourable conditions, the old cycle of mistaken faith and inevitable disillusion' (p. 168).

Among many valuable quotations Dr. Henson provides one from that great scientist and great Churchman, Sir Clifford Allbutt, which seems to us to be full of warning:

> 'Under the Roman Empire, as in our own time, the recrudescence of miraculous medicine—that is, of medicine by way of religious rites—has coincided with the time of eclipse, or at any rate of instability, of religious doctrines; and of change in our conception of the Divine Nature.'[2]

We would urge our bishops in this time of moral and religious instability, if they hesitate to go forward, at least to refrain from going back, and that they will not, under the plea of regulating practices which may so easily become superstitious and magical, give the sanction of the Church of England to rites which were deliberately and for excellent reasons abandoned and prohibited by the Fathers of the Reformation, who were also Sons of the New Learning.

[2] *British Medical Journal*, 18th June, 1910.

REFORMATION CONTACTS WITH ZURICH (1530—1575)

By H. Alexander Clay.

WHEN he said in *Utopia* 'that the Zapoletes were born only for war and that they offered themselves as soldiers for a small wage,' More was thinking of the mercenaries of Switzerland: '*gens haud ita dissimilis Eluetiis*' (*Helvetiis*), as the marginal note has it. The idea came from his close friend—a friend, too, of Erasmus—the humanist, Sir Richard Pace, who had been commissioned to bribe the Confederates to take arms against France. Though admitting that the Swiss did not fail their employers, he spoke in strong terms of their greed. Thus in *Utopia* the Zapoletes fight 'hardelye, fyerslye and faythefully,' but bind themselves for no certain time, and for greater wages will at any time take part with the other side. This was written in 1515, before Zwingli had aroused the conscience of the Protestant cantons against mercenary service.

Not a generation passed before the English learned that the Swiss people did not consist only of avaricious cut-throats. The early stirring of the Reformation drew Englishmen abroad to study; at first but few of them, but enough to make known where presently places of refuge might be found. The earliest contact with Switzerland was perhaps the correspondence of Cranmer with Simon Grynaeus, who, succeeding to Erasmus' chair at Basel, was invited to collect the views of the German and Swiss reformers on Henry's proposed divorce of Catharine of Aragon. Cranmer corresponded also with the sagacious Bullinger, who had succeeded Zwingli as head of the Reformed Church in Zürich. In 1536-37 we hear of six Englishmen arriving there to study the new theology; three to stay in the family of Pellikan, Professor of Hebrew, and three with Bullinger himself. One of them, John Butler, had been offered

> 'an honourable post about the king; but smitten with the love of the muses, he seemed to have an abhorrence of a courtier's life.'

Later on he settled in Zürich, and in 1552 an edition of Peter Martyr's *De Sacramento Eucharistiae* was dedicated to him. Another, William Petersen, not only studied, but was concerned

in purchasing bows to be exported to England. Another, Nicholas Partridge, conveyed to England in 1538 two treatises of Bullinger dedicated to Henry, who graciously ordered them to be translated. He writes to Bullinger:

> 'how great weight all persons attribute to your commentaries, how greedily they embrace and admire them . . . the booksellers are most ample witnesses, whom by the sale of your writings alone . . . you see suddenly become rich.'

Of these earlier pupils the most influential in England was Bartholomew Traheron, who had served under Cromwell and was enthusiastic for Edward VI, 'even now a defender of the Christian religion almost to a miracle.' He came to Zürich 'to forsake the puddels of the sophisters.' Through him a Swiss student, Johannes ab Ulmis, was appointed to instruct Lady Jane Grey, three of whose letters to Bullinger are treasured in the Zürich City Library. Traheron became Dean of Chichester, and on Mary's accession fled to Frankfort, where he taught in the 'university' set up for the maintenance of learning among the English exiles.

Interesting friends of Bullinger at this time, though not men of learning, were Richard Hilles and John Burcher. Hilles, a cloth merchant, lived chiefly at Strassburg. His letters deal much with affairs of the Church, but he gives also the news of the day in England, the more welcome to his friends as there were not yet newspapers. He describes, for instance, the fall of Cromwell, Henry's marriage with Catharine Howard, and the executions of her uncle, the Duke of Norfolk, and of her cousin, the Earl of Surrey. During Mary's reign Hilles feared to write to or receive letters from Bullinger, and his servant accuses him of having attended mass. At any rate, he was faithful to his old friends, and received with kindness many students who were recommended to him from abroad. Burcher, another merchant, was introduced by Hilles, with a testimonial from Miles Coverdale, who was then teaching at Bergzabern, and he may have acquired the citizenship of Zürich, for by and by he signs himself 'Anglo-Tigurinus.' Writing to Bullinger in 1546, he mentions the attempt referred to by Hilles of the Duke of Norfolk to restore the Pope's authority, and adds:

> 'he is thrown into prison: nor is anyone wanting but Winchester alone, and unless he also be caught, the evangelist truth cannot be restored.'

In 1549, anxious about the possible renewal of a treaty under which Switzerland was to help France to reconquer Calais and Boulogne, he wrote that he hoped the Swiss would mediate to bring about a peace, for while the mouse (France) and the frog (England) were fighting together, the eagle (the German Emperor) might devour them both. Bullinger replied that in order not to fight the English, the reformed cities had not joined the alliance, and he wished the king (Edward) would justify to them his point of view, exhorting them not to war with one who did not deserve their enmity. A few months later the desired message from 'Our Palace at Westminster, to the honourable and valiant Lords of Zürich, our right entirely beloved friends,' was conveyed by Christopher Mont, who was commanded also to make other things known to them. From Strassburg again in 1550 Burcher writes :

> 'New sects are daily rising among us—more absurd questions are asked by silly people than even those of the followers of Thomas or Scotus.'

In 1553 Bullinger's sons were living with him in Strassburg. In 1554 he mentions the execution of Lady Jane Grey, and that 'the rebels have put to death 300 mass priests,' which seems to have been a rumour. Later (1558) we hear from him in Cracow, where besides his religious endeavours he was hoping

> 'to secure a licence to instruct the brewers, of whom there were at least 500, in the art of brewing.'

One of the first religious refugees from England was the amiable and ill-fated John Hooper, who, 'living too much of a court life,' had fallen in with the writings of Zwingli. Becoming protestant in Henry's reign in 1539, he fled abroad and in 1547 came from Strassburg with his wife to Zürich. Already on in years, he studied seriously and learned Hebrew from Pellikan. His reply to Gardiner in this year was the first book in the English language to be printed in Zürich :

> 'An Answer unto my lord of Wynchester's booke intytlyd a detection of the deuyls Sophistrye, wherwith he robbith the unlernyd people of the trew byleef in the mosst blessyd Sacra-ment of the aulter made by Johann Hoper . . . Pryntyd in Zürych by Augustine Fries. Anno M.D.XLVII.

As might be expected, it contains an endless number of misprints. Two other works of Hooper were printed in English in Zürich, one by Froschower.

From Cologne, *en route* to England[1] in 1549, he commends to Bullinger the Flemish scholar Utenhovius, who is going to Zürich

> 'to observe the mode of administering the Lord's supper, which as it is most simple among you, so it is most pure. He will report with how much unwillingness he (the Admiral, Lord Seymour) suffered death, and will explain by word of mouth.'

From Antwerp he writes that at Brussels he could not see the Duke of Saxony, who had Protestant sympathies, nor the Landgrave of Hesse, who was in confinement at Oudenarde. The country was in bondage to the Spaniards. He warns Bullinger that the Emperor

> 'will leave no stone unturned to destroy your union (*i.e.* of the Protestant cantons): I pray you therefore to preserve your mutual regard and unanimity.'

Officers of the Canton of Lucerne were often seen in his palace, and

> 'it is to be feared the secret affairs of the country may be revealed, or some yet greater evil may be latent.'

Hooper was not to see Zürich again. He became Bishop of Gloucester in 1550 and in 1552 of Worcester (*in commendam*). He cherished a constant gratitude towards his friends. He advises Bullinger to send his writings to King Edward, which was done. To Conrad Gesner of Zürich, the philosopher and naturalist, the Pliny of 'Germany'[2] he sends

> 'a Welsh dictionary and some writing in the language of Cornubia, commonly called Cornwall': 'and should master Gesner wish at any time to come over to us, I will provide him with suitable companions, who will show him the rivers and fishes and animals of this country.'

Hooper's reluctance to be tonsured, to wear episcopal vestments and to carry the pastoral staff at his consecration (at Gloucester) are described by Utenhovius, writing to Bullinger from London in 1551.

Mary came to the throne on August 3, 1553, and on the first of September he was imprisoned in the Fleet. Thence in December, 1554, he wrote to Bullinger his last letter, knowing well that a martyr's death awaited him. His wife with her little Rachel had already fled to Frankfort, where the Senate had granted

[1] At its worst a journey of fifty-seven days.

[2] So called by Cuvier, who mistakenly includes Switzerland in Germany. Gesner made one of the earliest attempts in his *Mithridates* in comparative philology.

liberty to the English refugees. There is a short Latin letter from her to Bullinger, and with it in Rachel's name (he was her godfather) she sends an English coin on which are the heads 'Ahab and Jezebel' (Philip II and Queen Mary).

The first news of the Marian persecutions reached Bullinger from Peter Martyr Vermigli, the Italian scholar, whom Cranmer had invited to Oxford. Gardiner, to his honour, had enabled him to escape from England. Hundreds of refugees now fled to Emden, Wesel, Frankfort, Strassburg and the Swiss reformed cities, Zürich, Basel and Geneva. In April, 1554, a group of twelve reached Zürich and petitioned the Council for leave to settle there:

> 'The Lord knoweth, for whose sake we have left our all, that we seek for nothing besides himself. And for this reason chiefly we have unanimously and with ready minds come to this place where he is most sincerely preached and most purely worshipped.'

They were lodged accordingly in a house belonging to Froschower, the printer, which still stands (Stüssihofstatt No. 13). Nine of them rose in after days under Elizabeth to high rank, as shown after their names: Robert Horne, Bishop of Winchester, with his wife Margery; James Pilkington, Bishop of Durham; Thomas Bentham, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; Lawrence Humphrey, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford and Dean of Winchester; Thomas Lever, Master of St. John's, Cambridge, afterwards Canon of Durham; William Cole, President of Corpus Christi, Oxford, afterwards Dean of Lincoln; Thomas Spencer, Archdeacon of Chichester; John Mullins, Archdeacon of London; and Michael Reniger, Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth herself. Soon there followed another group, among whom were John Parkhurst, later Bishop of Norwich; John Jewel, later Bishop of Salisbury; Thomas Sampson, later Dean of Chichester; and Edwin Sandys, later Bishop of London and Archbishop of York. Thus in this Athens on the Limmat of seven thousand people, a small but distinguished English 'colony' was formed. Bullinger lectured to them and they studied Greek and Hebrew. Their maintenance was defrayed by one of the first petitioners, Richard Chambers, whose home was in Frankfort. Only once was there a request for help, and fortunately, for in May, 1555, there arrived one hundred and

sixteen Italian Protestants from Locarno, who had to be provided for.

In 1556 Chambers and Horne returned to Frankfort. Thence writing to the Senate of Zürich,

> 'so compassionate as to be entertainers of the humble, wandering, dispersed and wretched members of the church,'

they say they were

> 'almost compelled to leave Zürich by two importunate letters of our countrymen, to relieve the extreme necessity of the now almost ruined church of our exiles at Frankfort. Forgive us therefore that we could no longer be onerous to those whom we desire to do honour.'

Four years later (1558) Mary died, and the exiles could return to England. The two volumes of 'Zürich Letters' (Cambridge, 1842 and 1845) are abundant evidence of the affectionate gratitude they felt for their former hosts. In these letters they send news of the progress of Church reform in England, the dying out of Romanism, the beginnings of dissent, events in the Netherlands, the suitors of Elizabeth, and such like. A few excerpts may serve to illustrate. To Peter Martyr, John Jewel writes from London (March, 1559):

> 'two great virtues, *viz.* ignorance and obstinacy have wonderfully increased at Oxford since you left: religion and all hope of good learning and talent is altogether abandoned . . . the scenic apparatus of divine worship is now under agitation . . . as if the Christian religion could not exist without something tawdry.'

And in March, 1560:

> 'you may now sometimes see at Paul's cross, after the service, 6000 persons old and young of both sexes, singing together and praising God. This sadly annoys the mass priests (*sacrificos*) and the devil.'

In May, 1561, he writes to Bullinger that he hears the son of the standard-bearer is with the Earl of Bedford,[3] and that when he comes to London he will send for him and treat him as a Züricher after the Zürich fashion. More homely:

> 'Give a kiss for me to your little son, whom I fancy I can hear squalling even here (*huc usque*).'

And the heartfelt cry:

> 'O Zürich! Zürich! how much oftener do I now think of thee than ever I thought of England when I was in Zürich!' (O Tigurum! Tigurum! quanto ego nunc saepius de te cogito quam unquam de Anglia, cum essem Tiguri!)

[3] The Earl of Bedford had visited Zürich in 1557 and wrote to Bullinger from Venice how gladly he would repay the incredible kindness which had been shown him and his compatriots.

So, too, John Parkhurst writes to Bullinger:

> 'If only a dog from Zürich were to come to him he would treasure him and not treat him at all like a dog (plurimi facerem nec canino more tractarem).'

To Conrad Gesner, May, 1559, he mentions having called in vain on Gesner's intimate friend Caius, the court physician and co-founder of Gonville and Caius College. Thomas Sampson writes to Bullinger how gladly he would return to his little home, the 'tuguriolum' he owned in Zürich. He had written three years before to Peter Martyr his disappointment that the crucifix and candlesticks and the golden vestments of Papacy were retained in the Queen's chapel. In 1570 Pilkington writes to Bullinger:

> 'I can truly say of your happy Zürich what the psalmist speaks concerning Jerusalem . . . if I do not remember thee, Jerusalem, above my chief joy . . .'

And fifteen years after his exile ended, Sandys writes to him, in August, 1573, that he longs to escape from his overwhelming cares (as Bishop of London) and to spend his remaining days in Zürich as a private sojourner. He sends with the letter a present of English cloth to be made into a gown.

Bullinger died in September, 1575. Among the last letters to him is one from Farnham, from Bishop Horne, in January, 1573, regretting that the Church is now troubled by false brethren, who seem to be sliding into anabaptism. And the same year Pilkington writes to Gwalter, who was married to a daughter of Zwingli, 'the Papists exult that we are now fighting each other.'

Tangible tokens of remembrance were not wanting. In December, 1563, Horne sends two crowns to the poor widows who waited on his colleagues and himself when they lived in Froschower's house. In February, 1572, Sandys assigns twenty crowns from his own purse, for their relatives' and their country's sake, to enable certain young Swiss to study at Cambridge. They were to be in different colleges, lest intercourse with one another should hinder their learning English. At Oxford, as well as Cambridge, Swiss students were welcomed in the best society.[4] The National Museum in Zürich possesses four goblets presented in gratitude for former hospitality. They are from

[4] Rudolf Zwingli, the grandson of the Reformer Huldreich Zwingli, died in the house of the Bishop of Ely in London.

Bishops Parkhurst of Norwich, Horne of Winchester, and from Jewel of Salisbury, who three years earlier had sent ten French crowns to meet the cost of a public supper. The fourth, made probably at Strassburg, was presented to Bullinger by Elizabeth herself, with the inscription :

> Anglorum exsilium Tigurina Ecclesia fovit ;
> Sub Mariæ Sceptris id sancte agnovit Elisa ;
> Et Bullingerum hoc donavit munere poclo ; A° 1560.

We may close this attempt to show the close connection between the English and the Swiss reformers by mentioning a letter, from Greenwich, from Elizabeth to the city of Zürich, dated July 18, 1590, in which she points out that aid is required by the distressed condition of the confederate city of Geneva, now blockaded for many years by Spain and Savoy. The destruction of the several states is their final aim, but in vain if the cantons do not brook the unripping and undoing of their amities and coalitions :

> 'Ourself, though a woman, has taken the lead in this contest. We commend to your good faith the battered remnant of your severely besieged countrymen.'

We cannot but feel in these letters from the former exiles, now eminent men, the almost sovereign influence of Bullinger. His replies to them unfortunately are not collected, but we know that the many English translations of his works had great weight in the development of the new Church of England ; for instance, every minister under the degree of Master of Arts was ordered by Archbishop Whitgift to read one sermon of his Decads every week. We know that he was 'the common father of the afflicted' (so Pilkington), and in this his brother ministers share the honour. Zürich has always had a heart for religious rebels and refugees. Arnold of Brescia found a home there in the twelfth century ; and during the Reformation Ulrich von Hutten, and the Marian and the Italian exiles ; also the elder Socinus, whom Lecky calls a rationalist in the first period of Protestantism.

JESUS THE MESSIAH *

The woman saith unto him, I know that Messiah cometh.—JOHN iv, 25.

THE story of the woman of Samaria need not be literal history, but it is evidence of the expectation of a personal Messiah in the first century. This expectation became general after the destruction of Jerusalem, perhaps largely for political reasons. But there is no evidence that the Samaritan expectation was political, and so Christ is able to say boldly to the woman, 'I am he.'

There is only one other verse in the New Testament where we find the Hebrew name 'Messiah'; it is in the first chapter of this Gospel, where Andrew says to Peter, 'We have found the Messiah.' We need not attach much importance to the name. It is never actually used in the Old Testament as a name for the expected Redeemer, whereas it is applied to Saul, to Cyrus, and to the high priest. 'The Lord's Anointed' was a title that might be used of any king. What we are concerned with is the fact that the Old Testament is 'a literature of expectancy.' The kingdom which it expects is the kingdom of God. We may call it a Messianic kingdom, but the Messiah appears and disappears. In the Old Testament he is not always the central figure: in the New Testament he is. 'Christianity is Christ.' Or, as Dr. Montefiore puts it, 'If Jesus preached the kingdom, his followers preached *him*.'

The Old Testament expectation takes several forms. It is of an earthly kingdom, a feast of fat things, and it includes military glory and conquered foes. But it is also a kingdom of righteousness and peace, ruled over by a Prince of Peace. And when spiritual hopes conflict with materialistic, all who believe in spiritual religion and a kingdom not of this world must choose the spiritual hope. But the Jews who crucified Christ did not do this. They corrupted the idea of the Messiah by fierce nationalism, as some Jews are still doing now. They did not see that

* The Macbride sermon on Messianic Prophecy preached before the University of Oxford on January 22nd, 1933, by the Rev. T. F. Royds, B.D., Rector of Haughton, Staffordshire.

the monotheism of the eighth century prophets necessitates universalism. In other words, that the one God of all the earth cannot love one nation only, and that the Gentiles were fellow-heirs with them to the promises fulfilled in Christ. Again, they failed to reconcile their idea of a triumphant Messiah with the suffering Servant of the Lord, although no figure in their own Scriptures more clearly reflects a crucified Christ. They wanted a saviour or deliverer in the earthly sense — a great patriot, whose kingdom might indeed ultimately be a kingdom of righteousness and peace, but still a kingdom of this world and a Jewish kingdom.

Dr. Montefiore thinks it was not the universalist element in Christ's teaching that caused the conflict with the Jews—it was His attitude to the Law. The Law was believed to be of divine origin, but He claimed the right to abrogate it when He liked, and in so doing He made Himself equal with God. He came, according to Matthew, not to destroy but to fulfil, and even said that not one iota or comma of the Law should pass away till the end of all things (*Matt.* v, 18; *cf. Luke* xvi, 17). I for one cannot regard that as a genuine saying of His. He did indeed fulfil or complete the Law, but He did it by being what the Law pointed to and prepared the way for, and by giving a character, a temper and a spirit to supersede a written code. He was undoubtedly an anti-legalist. *Lex Christi lex amoris*, as Bengel says. 'Love is the fulfilling of the law.' And that means *being someone* rather than *doing things*. But legalism, that is, love of obedience to external rules, and dislike of originality and responsibility, is deeply ingrained in human nature. It is implied in Sohm's well-known saying, 'The natural man is a born Catholic.' The Church took it over from Judaism, and the Judaizing Christians of the first century gave St. Paul much trouble. At the same time, we do not hear that they thought it necessary to secede from the Church; and the type of religion which they loved is now firmly established in the Catholic Churches.

The modern Jew who objects to the anti-legalism of Christ ought to find a home in at least one of the Churches of Christ to-day. But there is a much more serious difficulty in his way. It is that, in Dr. Montefiore's opinion, Christianity 'deified a man and invented the Trinity.' Liberal Jews and Christian Modernists are stretching out their hands to one another now as

never before, but I do not see how it is possible to bridge the gulf that divides those who accept the divinity or deity of Christ in any sense from those who deny it. At the same time, it is not fair to treat popular tritheism as if it represented the opinion of the best scholars. For instance, the average Jew and the average Christian know little or nothing of the history of the word 'Person' and why it was ever used of the distinctions in the nature of God. And this ignorance is sometimes shared by those who ought to know better. It appears in *Judaism as Creed and Life*, a book by an orthodox Jew, the Rev. Morris Joseph, published in 1903. He does not seem to be aware that the monotheism of the Old Testament is common ground to Jews and Christians. Our doctrine of the Trinity is based upon the Unity of God; and, as Dr. Rashdall used to claim in his valuable expositions of it, it is not irrational and may fairly be offered to any Jew who is open to conviction.

The Lord our God is One Lord, and in the Old Testament He Himself is the Saviour, Redeemer and King of His people. We find all three titles freely used in *Isaiah*. It is not a human Messiah, but God Himself who is called 'Saviour' and 'Redeemer.' And this is highly significant. It means that Jesus as our Saviour and Redeemer is taking on Himself the functions of God. 'In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.'

Here is the great dividing line between Judaism and Christianity, the humanity of God manifested in the Man, Christ Jesus. There is nothing in the Old Testament that quite necessitates this, and here the Jews are right. The Messiah is not essential to the Messianic kingdom, and even in *Isaiah* vii and ix the predicted child is but human. No one now takes the headings of the Authorized Version seriously. We read repeatedly of 'Christ' and 'Christ's kingdom,' and in the heading of xl, 3, even of 'the preaching of John Baptist.' But all scholars agree now that there is no exact prediction of Christ. The *Book of Isaiah* has gone through precisely the same kind of process as the Fourth Eclogue of *Virgil*. Virgil's divine child was hailed by Constantine as 'without doubt our blessed Saviour.' Twenty-five years ago Sir William Ramsay suggested that he was not an individual at all, but the nation. This is very improbable; but the suffering Servant of the Lord in *Deutero-Isaiah* probably

does represent the faithful remnant of the nation. He is an ideal figure, half-divine; but the prophet, as always, had a message for his own time, and was not looking for a Messiah who should appear more than five centuries later.

And the same is true of the Immanuel prophecy in chapter vii, and of the Prince of the fourfold name in chapter ix: 'Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.' Even if this translation is accurate, which is highly doubtful, it is misleading to modern ears. To predict a Messiah who should himself be Very God out of Very God would have nullified the stern monotheism that runs through the prophet's message. We must not read our Christology into his words. Christ is above and greater than anything predicted in the Old Testament.

But 'I know that Messiah cometh.' How did that woman know it? In what sense did the Messiah who stood before her and said 'I am he' fulfil the Scriptures? By the Scriptures I mean here not only the Old Testament, but also the apocalyptic literature between the Testaments, including the *Book of Enoch* and the *Psalms of Solomon*. As Dr. R. H. Charles and others have shown, the Old Testament was completed and transformed by apocalyptic. The orthodox Jewish expectation was of a purely human Messiah with an earthly Jewish kingdom: in apocalyptic we find the hope of a divine Son of Man, and a kingdom within man, world-wide and in the world to come—a universal and eternal kingdom. This is the hope that Christ alone fulfils.

How far did Christ fulfil the Old Testament? He was, as St. Paul says, of the seed of David according to the flesh; and we find this predicted as early as *II Samuel* vii, where we read the promise that the throne of David shall be established for ever. He was acknowledged to be a prophet, if not *the* prophet foretold by Moses. The woman of Samaria says to him, 'Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet.' Some wondered whether He was the prophet or the Christ (*cf. John* vii, 41). He was both. No one called Him a priest during His earthly ministry. He was not a Kohên, and the ministry of His Church was not modelled on the Jewish priesthood. In Lightfoot's well-known words, 'Above all the kingdom of Christ has no sacerdotal system.' Psalm cx is unique. 'Thou art a priest for ever after the

order of Melchisedec.' This psalm is probably Maccabaean, *i.e.* it belongs to the second century B.C., and it is noticeable that here it is not the Levitical priesthood that is spoken of, but an eternal priesthood. We find this train of thought developed in *Hebrews*. The earthly Jesus was a layman, but after the Ascension He entered on His heavenly and eternal priesthood. May we not say that He fulfilled the Jewish priesthood in the same kind of way as He fulfilled the Jewish Law? He preserved what was good in it, and used it as a stepping-stone to something higher and more spiritual.

Christ was prophet and priest; He was also king. He accepted the title. 'Art thou the King of the Jews? Thou sayest' (*Mark* xv, 2). 'Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment. And a man shall be as an hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.' So said Isaiah (xxxii, 1, 2). And his hopes were partly fulfilled in Hezekiah. But the fame of Hezekiah was transitory and hazardous, as we see in the last chapter of Isaiah's own book. It was too much built upon earthly success to endure. Yet Isaiah's prophecies were allowed to stand, though partly falsified by events. Why? Because, as Sir George Adam Smith puts it, Messianic prophecies are like tidal rivers: they feel the reflex influence of Christ.

Of no passage is this so true, I think, as of *Isaiah* liii. 'The influence of this great passage of Scripture upon the mind of Christ can hardly be measured' (G. H. Box). He saw in it a reflection of His own face. And at the beginning of His ministry, according to *Luke* iv, 18, He read the opening words of *Isaiah* lxi, 'The spirit of the Lord is upon me,' and applied them to Himself. 'To-day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears.' He was the suffering Servant of the Lord in *Deutero-Isaiah*, as well as the Prince of Peace in Isaiah's own book. Not that He consciously modelled Himself upon any prophet's dream of what the Messiah ought to be. He was far too great and original for that. I must not in one short sermon enter into the critical questions raised by the titles 'Son of Man' and 'Son of God.' I am only trying to show that Jesus Christ fulfilled the Scriptures in many ways. He fulfilled the desire of all nations—and that not

least by begetting us again unto a living hope by His resurrection from the dead. That hope is now, I believe, part of the faith of orthodox Judaism. In the Old Testament it is a hope: in the New Testament it becomes a certainty through Christ. 'If we have only hoped in Christ in this life, we are of all men most pitiable. But now hath Christ been raised from the dead' (*I Cor.* xv, 19; R.V. margin).

Christ did indeed come 'not to destroy but to fulfil.' His Church is the true Israel: the family portraits are ours. The Jews who reject Him are false to their own Scriptures. They, not we, are the real schismatics, like the Popish recusants in the sixteenth century. No new Church was founded then, and there is some truth in the theory that Christ did not want a new Church but only a reformed Judaism. But that is not the whole truth. What does St. Paul say of his gospel?' 'For I received it not from man, neither was I taught it, but it came to me by revelation of Jesus Christ' (literally, 'by apocalypse of Jesus Christ') (*Gal.* i, 12). And again, 'By revelation was made known unto me the mystery' (*Eph.* iii, 3). It was a new thing, a supernatural thing, straight from God. Nothing less would have availed to convert the Jews, who were everywhere the fiercest opponents of the Gospel. The very fact that it did convert some of them helps to prove its supernatural origin and power. If in one sense Christ fulfilled the Scriptures, in another sense He did not, because He went so far beyond them. 'The Word was made flesh.' It was faith in the Lordship of Jesus that overcame the world. That is a hard saying to an orthodox Jew. The way of intellectual agreement is a hard way, and I venture to think that at present the best way to unity in the truth is the indirect way, the way of fellowship in the service of the One God and the doing of His Will. 'As systems of morality Judaism and Christianity may be said to be practically identical' (Morris Joseph, p. 8). If that is true—and can it be said of Christianity and any other religion?—surely it is a call to Jew and Christian to work together for the kingdom of God.

There are to-day two calls to service which ought to appeal to Jew and Christian alike. There is, firstly, the call to work for peace between the nations, in the name of the God of peace. 'And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse

from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off; and he shall speak peace unto the nations' (*Zech.* ix, 10; *cf. Is.* ii, 4; *Hos.* ii, 18; *Micah* iv, 3). There is, secondly, the call to fight the anti-God movement—in a word, atheistic Communism. I will not insult any pagan religion by calling Communism a return to paganism. It is rather a return to the jungle—to the kingdom of ignorance and selfishness and brute force. It would be irrelevant to discuss it here, and I only venture to allude to it because it seems to be to be our worst enemy to-day, and the clearest call to all who believe in God to work side by side for His kingdom of righteousness and peace.

The surest way to know of the doctrine whether it be of God is to do the will of God. We see around us to-day 'distress of nations with perplexity, men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth.' And what is the remedy? The twelfth article of the Jewish Creed still runs (in the words of Maimonides): 'I believe with my full faith in the coming of the Messiah, and though he tarry yet will I wait for him.' But that faith is crumbling now. In the U.S.A., so I am told, eighty-five per cent. of Jews have left the Synagogue entirely, and in Berlin sixty-five per cent. And the Saviour that they need has already come. He is not a warrior-king who shall bruise the nations with a rod of iron and break them in pieces like a potter's vessel, but One whose kingdom is not of this world. There is no complete earthly remedy for our distress, 'for our citizenship is in heaven.' A Jew who believes that is with us in spirit: he is half-way towards knowing that no man truly cometh unto the Father but by Him who has been found by nineteen centuries of Christian experience to be indeed the Way, the Truth and the Life.

A FURTHER PLEA FOR REFORM OF THE MARRIAGE LAWS*

By Dr. Boden-Worsley, author of *Mischiefs of the Marriage Law.*

THERE are principles of righteousness and truth which govern life; and we violate these at our peril. It does not require Christianity to tell us this, although our Christianity may illuminate this truth and render it clearer to us. But these principles of righteousness and truth are in their rudiments matters of experience and observation. Our religion personalizes these principles and calls them God. The Jesus of the Gospels in the circumstances of His time, subject to the physical and intellectual limitations of an human life, pursued a course illustrative of these principles, and in so doing manifested the character which men everywhere had sought in their search for God. His life rang true; and all who were of the truth heard His voice. He showed not merely what God is like, but what God is: not God in His cosmic aspect, not the power which sustains the firmament and the innumerable suns and systems which the ancient astrologers had not discovered; but the God of the character and the qualities to which the mind and heart and will of man respond. In this sense the life of Jesus was absolute. In the conditions of human life He showed Himself to be at one with the principles which rule the universe; and in this life of unwavering devotion He showed what is the character of God in what we may call the personal aspect, the many-sided character which we do but imperfectly comprehend in our ideas, and express in such words as goodness, truth, beauty, love. If Jesus never actually answered Pilate at the trial, the words attributed to Him in the Fourth Gospel would remain true to His life as we can estimate it when all the fires of criticism have passed across the New Testament, 'To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.'

But in the years which passed between the reported trial of Jesus and the composition of the Fourth Gospel, the Church

* The substance of a sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday morning, April 2nd, 1933.

had grown. The witness of the Founder to the truth in sayings relevant to the conditions of Palestine required adaptation to the new conditions of the Empire. For the Spirit of Christ, *i.e.* the Spirit of Truth in relation to the righteousness, the character and the conduct of man, requires a larger attitude and a more comprehensive policy than the repetition and the precise application of the *dicta* of the Gospels in the changed and ever-changing condition of the centuries.

To-day the conclusions of philosophy, the teaching of the sciences and the experience of the race, collected in that vast volume of evidence which is history, present a world of problems of which the solution is but partly furnished by secular learning and demand also the resolute invocation of the Spirit of Christ in thought and word and deed. The texts of Scripture, cited in isolation, will rarely help the modern world. The words of the Founder of Christianity are not to be interpreted as legislation. But the character of Jesus is the model of the character of man for all time. Our task is to realize this character in ourselves, but also to combine it with the progressive correlation of the principles of life which are verified from all sources; to bring upon the sorry scene of a distracted world the Spirit of Christ in place of the texts of scripture, and the principles of righteousness and truth in place of the prejudices of literalism and bad tradition.

In this great venture we might hope to see the National Church taking an intelligent and courageous part. The *rôle* of the Christian Churchman can be nothing less than his Master's. To 'bear witness to the truth' means nothing less than to correct the bad traditions of an historical Christianity which has perpetuated the letter to the exclusion of the spirit, and has preferred the ephemeral words of Jesus to His eternal character. But for those who seek, and seek to promote, this exhibition of strong purpose, there is no small disappointment.

From time to time the movement for the reform of the English Law in Matrimonial Causes becomes prominent in the public mind. Sometimes it reaches the stage of Parliamentary debate. But it commonly encounters a fierce ecclesiastical opposition. I wish to urge that, while the religion of literalism and of the invocation of texts may figure in this opposition, the dispassionate consideration of principles favours reform, both in the interest of the relief of man's estate and of morality itself.

The English Law, which, since the Act of 1857, allows divorce on one ground only, adultery, is in theory more strict — or more backward — than that of any modern country except Ireland and Italy. And although nullity of marriage, which flourished under the old Canon Law of the Catholick Church, has become very much more strict in the Roman Church to-day, yet the grounds of nullity in the Roman Church remain considerably more numerous than in the English Law. It may be said that three good characteristics of the English people have combined to produce a law which is at once muddled and mischievous. English Protestantism has curtailed the grounds of nullity; English devotion to the Bible has limited the grounds of dissolution of marriage to that ground which was thought to have the authority of the New Testament; English conservatism has retained in the Statute Law the principles and procedure of the old Canon Law. The second and third of these effects are those which illustrate our thesis.

(*a*) In the matter of the present ground of divorce theologians hold that among the reported sayings of Jesus the exceptional permission of divorce on the ground of adultery is the addition of an editor; and that there is therefore no specifically Christian reason for allowing adultery as the sole ground of divorce. It has been merely a well-nigh universal custom, in all religions which have admitted divorce, to make adultery the first ground. Fragmentary and confused as are the Gospel *dicta* on the subject, they are the evidence of dispute between Jesus and the representatives of the Jewish Schools; and their purport would seem to be to have disallowed the too frivolous pretexts for putting away a wife which prevailed among the Jews, and to have stated by contrast the ideal of indissoluble marriage.

Now this ideal holds without question in every marriage of affection; and here the Lord did but state a principle to which the mind and heart and will of man instinctively respond. Everybody desires a happy marriage to endure; as the Emperor Justin is reported to have asked, 'Who would wish to be rid of an ideal partner?' But where affection is absent, or has passed into deadly hatred, and has naturally been transferred into the desire for a fresh marriage, what would then be the mind of the living Christ? Is eternal Truth conditioned by the pronouncements which are recorded from a dispute occasioned by the ancient

Jewish law in the first century? The world to-day confronts us with a larger task than the citation of texts.

(*b*) But the authors of the Canon Law of the Catholick Church based their legislation on a literal reading of the texts of Scripture, and after much initial hesitation set aside the exception in *Matthew* and disallowed divorce proper on every ground. The procedure which the Canon Lawyers devised for the trial of such matrimonial suits as were recognized in Canon Law assumed that an offence had been committed and that the parties must be in a state of antagonism. The English Law in Matrimonial Causes to-day is in all its main points a survival of the Canon Law with the exceptional provision of dissolution for adultery borrowed from *Matthew* and incorporated in the Statute.

The result is that since divorce is obtainable only on one ground, those who desire divorce for whatever reason must conform to this one ground, with the effect of creating a great volume of adventitious sexual immorality, or the pretence of it. There are some for whom this conformity is not available or is unavailing; and it is seen in practice that divorce is impossible for some who deserve it, while it is too easy for some who deserve it less or not at all. There are many grounds more serious than the single act of adultery of which proof is requisite for dissolution. Cruelty and desertion are obvious. Incurable insanity may be added. And the fundamental ground of failure to love is not less serious in fact, but is discountenanced by the more cautious reformers only because it is more difficult to prove in law. The anomalous state of the English law, which exhibits the confusion between Christian principles, the letter of Scripture and the traditions of the mediaeval Church, could have no better illustration than in a judgment given in the House of Lords ten years ago in a case in which a wife was unable technically to prove the guilt of a husband with whom it was impossible to live :

> 'It is an unfortunate circumstance that she should be tied for life to a dangerous, violent and homicidal lunatic, after having for many years suffered both in body and in spirit from his unfaithfulness and his cruelty. He is forty-one years of age and she is forty. We need take little account of his feelings. As regards her, we are bound to note that during many more years, unless death remove him or release her, she must look forward to a loneliness from which she can escape only by a violation of the moral law. To some this may appear a harsh and even an inhuman result, but such is the law of England . . . The true remedy lies outside any Court of Law; it lies beyond the scope of

> your Lordship's faculties, sitting as the supreme appellate tribunal. It rests with Parliament (if and when it thinks proper) to end a state of things which in a civilized community and in the name of morality imposes such an intolerable hardship upon innocent men and women.'

Those are the words of the late Lord Birkenhead; and I believe that, beyond the limited circumstances of that particular case, they represent the considered attitude of all who sincerely try to correlate Christian principles with the facts of matrimonial life. But the reason why this confused and backward branch of the English Law goes unreformed is to be found in the stolid opposition of an ecclesiastical minority. Of the Law itself, in the large sense of the term, the first and greatest of all professions, the description remains true (except unfortunately in some very small local Courts which try petty offences) that 'the final cause of law is the welfare of society'; and the Law itself is painfully aware of the inherited defects and anomalies of the branch which most faithfully exhibits the worse traditions of the Church. It is high time for the Christian Church to face this issue fairly. If we appeal to principles and not to texts, we must admit that the destinies of human life which are in issue are of greater import than the tradition which would disallow the relief of matrimonial distress except by the death of one of the parties. In any event the principle of dissolubility of marriage is established in the English Law, and there can be no repeal of the Statute which provides for divorce on the ground of adultery. To extend the grounds in order to give relief to those who at present have none unless they can pinch their cause within the definition of this one ground, is not to abandon principles, but to promote justice, to curtail deception, and to prevent abuse. This extension, apart from its practical value, would seem to be in greater conformity with larger principles than is the present law of which, although it is but a half-measure, the Church never fails to oppose the reform. To those who press their tradition against the consensus of principles and the welfare of society, the very *raison d'être* of Christianity is voiced down the centuries, 'To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.'

A single example, which I have described as 'flagrant,' might suggest that the life of society in England would flourish more fruitfully without a Church; and there are those who wish to see

the Church of England disestablished — not because they wish it to be 'independent,' as some of its more misguided friends do wish — but because they wish to see it dead. That catastrophe, of course, would still leave them to reckon with the religions of Rome and of Dissent; and since the Established Church offers the most hopeful, or the least hopeless, prospect of the correlation of religion and reason, the witness of the Spirit of Truth in the life of the world, the last state of society might be worse than the first.

But it is not only on Churchmen that the onus rests of bringing the large principles of truth and righteousness to bear on the life of society. It rests with all enlightened citizens in their several callings; and in ideal conditions the Church would give them an enlightened lead. Where the State seeks to apply these principles to the advantage of society it might at least be supposed that the Church will not continue to frustrate the truth with the fetters of tradition. For in the long run the work of frustration will yield, like King Cnut, before the advancing waves; and an official Church, which has resisted humane reforms in those moral and intellectual issues which are its close concern, will have lost the influence and the prestige which it needs for its task of upholding the life of the Spirit in the life of the world—which is the 'witness to the truth.'

The English Church is inseparably interwoven with the life of England; and we could wish for the Church nothing greater than the aspiration of the great Oxford historian, Dr. Stubbs, when he asked :

> 'What does England represent? What is she to represent in the future? What would we wish for her, but clear-sighted justice and living sympathy with what is good and sound in the progress of the world?'

Such a future will be conditional upon a close concern for the principles of righteousness and truth, alike their comprehensiveness and their severity; and it is the part of the Church itself and of every Christian Churchman to adopt, with a full responsibility for the consequences, the declaration of the Founder of Christianity in the Fourth Gospel, 'To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.'

THE SPIRIT OF TRUTH*

'The Spirit of truth . . . shall guide you into all the truth.'
—*John* xvi, 13.

A HUNDRED years ago, at the Deanery of Hadleigh in my Diocese, Hugh James Rose, Rector, and a few friends inaugurated the Oxford Movement. Three hundred years earlier another Rector of Hadleigh, Rowland Taylor, was burnt at the stake for heresy, and his monument stands in a field just outside the little town to bear witness in this further century to his faithfulness unto death.

The different treatment accorded to the Oxford reformers in the nineteenth century from that which the Protestant reformer suffered in the sixteenth may be regarded as an illustration of the growth of modernism. For if that change of treatment, and the still more tolerant temper of our own age, are in part the outcome of a better Christian spirit, of the recognition that even if men should be mistaken they should be borne with, and that Christian men should learn to bear with one another, it is perhaps still more the result of the acknowledgment that truth is one, and is only to be discovered by patience, by the frank expression of belief and of the reasons for it, by the application to all such expressions and conclusions of a perfectly free criticism, and by the retention of the open mind. That is the spirit of modernism.

It is not unfitting, I think, that at the annual service of the Modern Churchmen's Union, one who is not a member of the Union though in complete sympathy with its aims, should join with you in an expression of thankfulness for the progress of the movement for which you stand. The reality of that progress is evident and has had somewhat remarkable testimony given to it, notably, for example, in the article by the Dean of Rochester quoted in the April number of the *Modern Churchman*, 'most intelligent persons to-day are modernists.' But what precisely is implied by those words is possibly less than many of us desire

* The sermon preached on May 31, 1933, by the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich at the Corporate Communion of the Modern Churchmen's Union in St. Andrew's Church, Westminster

to see. It has a rather suspicious resemblance to the phrase, 'all thoughtful people to-day are socialists,' which, while it has a valuable element of truth, means something different from and less than that which a definite socialist has in his mind. To accept the evidences of geology, and so to regard the early chapters of *Genesis* as not incompatible with the endorsement by a genuine Christian of the theory of evolution, and to admit in general certain broad results of the application of literary and historical criticism of the Bible, may actually be to be going a long way along the Modernist road, but may still be compatible with considerable suspicion of the Modernist attitude. Moreover, Dean Underhill may perhaps not be altogether representative in this respect of the whole of his own school of thought. It is at all events plain that a good many Church people still look somewhat askance at the Modernist. If they recognize an underlying life and spirit that properly belongs to all the recognized types of Christianity, and are prepared to respect the sincerity of those who regard themselves as of the Movement, they are hardly prepared to admit that the Modernist position is perfectly sound, and indeed the only sound position, and that its methods and principles can be confidently relied upon.

The ground of objection to our method is not merely the conservatism which has at all times distinguished the profession of religion—a conservatism which is much more than a habit of mind or a clinging to what appears to be stable in the face of what is new and untried; it is really the consequence of moral and spiritual convictions which are closely attached to and go along with certain helps and supports and even assumptions which criticism questions. It is so closely attached to these that something of the sacred character which belongs to the convictions is allowed to invest also these supports and assumptions, giving them a character that they ought not to possess. As a consequence of this, whatever questions the strict validity of any of these outlying helps and considerations seems to be directed against the faith itself. This is well seen in the attitude of the so-called Fundamentalist in his view of the Bible. The Fundamentalist has certain definite religious convictions which are his faith. These he has been led to and they have been nurtured in him by the English version of the Bible taken in a very literal

sense. This particular version of it literally understood, and even a particular interpretation of it, is so closely associated in his mind with his faith that any attempt to criticize them shocks him because it seems to him to be making an attack upon his faith and even upon God. What gives to some their faith in the Bible and to others their reliance on tradition is the belief that the Book in the one case and the Church in the other carry explicitly and in authoritative terms the Divine voice. Modernism then becomes to these an attempt to substitute a human voice for the Divine, to surrender what God reveals in favour of what man can discover. Revelation is God's way of teaching mankind religion. The questioning approach seems to be a dethroning of the Divine in order to place man's efforts in the place of it, so putting religion on the same plane as natural or any other science.

We have therefore to make two things plain. First, that the Modernist does not question the Divine voice and its authority. What he does is to endeavour to disentangle that voice from the imperfect human voices through which it comes to them, and it is really because he holds the Divine voice in the utmost reverence that he seeks to have that voice in all its authority and purity, free from any human imperfection that may attach to the mode by which it has reached him.

Secondly, we have to urge that human intelligence is the God-given means by which the truth of God is known. That it is human is no more in its disfavour than is the case with faith. Faith, too, is human and often very imperfect. It is the means whereby we know God Himself, just as intelligence is the means whereby we know religious truth, and this is on the plane of our knowledge of scientific truth. It is true that there is a moral and spiritual impressiveness about religious truth which places it on a level of its own; but all truth is impressive, and with respect to the whole of it God's revelation and man's discovery are correlative. Man can only know what God reveals, and what is revealed cannot be known till man by his intelligence apprehends it.

The real issue, however lies somewhat deeper than this. What men tend to seek, and apparently have always sought, in the midst of the obscurity and perplexity of so much of our life

is some authority on which they can rely in respect of those things that matter most to us — our origin and destiny, the purpose of life and its plan, the scope of moral law and its claims, the relation between man and the unseen. They ask for an authority not inherent in the truth itself, but outside it and distinct from it, giving validity to what is authoritatively given—a validity which, without the authority, would not be evident. This appears to be precisely what the disciples sought. Their attitude and occasionally their question took the form of seeking a declaration from their Lord on which they could rely simply because it had His authority. There may well be truths that we are prepared to accept thus and for which we have no further warrant. But it is broadly true to say that Christ did not as a rule teach in this way or expect His followers to rely either on His own words or in the Old Testament Scriptures on teaching so given. There was no doubt much that He might have said that the disciples would have gladly taken on His word which it seemed to Him inadvisable to teach them because it was beyond them to follow. He preferred in that case to leave it unsaid; but He would give them a guide which would lead them to their own conclusions when He was no longer there to give the lead, a spirit by whose aid they would find out for themselves.

Unhappily, as it seems to me, the craving for authority has led men to confine His gift to the New Testament writers or to the Church expressing its mind through its official ministry and Councils, transferring thus to the Bible or Church a liberty of judgment which is open to all who will prayerfully and humbly use the intelligence which God has given them and which they have the opportunity of diligently training for its purpose. The gift of Christ is not a spirit that proclaims what is to be laid to heart through a channel outside the mind of man, because it has authority; rather it is a spirit within the mind of man by which man is able to discover what has the ring of truth, and by which what is given is tested and its truth manifested.

We meet the objections of those who reject Modernism, then, by three arguments:

(1) There is no ground for looking for an authority in religion outside and apart from the truth itself on the strength of

which we accept as true what otherwise we could not prove or see the truth of.

(2) There is no substitution in Modernism of the human for the Divine voice, for God gives men religious knowledge in the way in which He invariably helps them to know. He gives the spirit by which man may find out truth. It is always the truth of God that is revealed: the truth given it is always for man to find out.

(3) Hence, truth is one the world over and the method of its ascertainment is always the same. Religious truth is, and is of necessity in this respect, on the same plane as natural or any other science.

And here it is not unfitting that religious men should pay their tribute to what science has won for religious truth, so that what science has unfolded has become the method, and actually the only method, whereby theological enquiry can be soundly pursued. Science may indeed be said to have acted on the religious principle colloquially expressed as 'heaping coals of fire on the head' of religion. What was suspect as supposed to be undermining faith has proved to have discovered and given to religion the method by which religious truth can be most securely established.

On the other hand, the Church of England has been forward in advancing the other side of the application of scientific method, the matter of education. Though sometimes its scope has been unduly restricted, on the whole the aim of the Church to provide and lead the way in giving education has been clear and definite, and it furnishes a great ground for hope.

But we shall not convince the mass of Christian men unless we can disentangle what is of the essence of religion itself from the truth which supports it. For everyone who has any religion in him is aware that this was not established by argument, or patient investigation or intellectual process. Religion is not what may be said or thought about it; it is not theology; it is not even truth. There *is* religious truth, but religion itself is something apart from this. You may describe a man's character, but the man himself is something other than the description of him. You may describe the Cross of Christ and investigate the story of His birth and death, and make enquiry into the historical

veracity of the accounts of the Resurrection, and construct from your conclusions a Christology or a system of Christianity: but a man or woman gladly, humbly, lovingly living a life of devoted service to a group of helpless human creatures in the spirit of self-sacrifice, or for Christ's sake, is something quite distinct from any theology that may be deduced from the critical examinations of those recorded occurrences. When one urges that something is given Him by the Divine voice which is not brought to Him by the processes of human reasoning and is largely independent of them, he is urging what we know to be true. The binding of the mind and will of man to God and His law, the response to the appeal of conscience, of the claim of men to loyalty and sympathy and active help, to our love, the response to the claim of God Himself as Father and to Jesus Christ as Lord, these, however it may have come about, constitute the core of spiritual life in every child of man.

We are bound to mark this distinction as clearly as we can, the distinction between the intellectual processes by which religious truth is won and maintained, and the faith of man in God and the surrender of his inner self to God's will.

Perhaps if we could get the sense of unity in this real essential religion recognized we should be going a long way towards winning a full freedom from the bondage of a mistaken theology enforced by an usurped authority. How many controversial issues that divide us would seem to be of small significance on the scale of such a unity? But this is hard to achieve, mainly, as it seems to me, not because the issues tend to be confused, not simply because the line of demarcation between the fact of religion and the intellectual processes by which it is supported is hard to trace, but because the faith of man is so inadequate.

Is it a vain hope that the unity of Christendom will be attained, not by agreement on the terms of our creed, not on a common consent, under whatever differences of implied meaning, of a unity of organization, but by the conscious possession of the one Spirit making manifest, possibly even under differences of administration, that there is really one body, since the living spirit which flows through all the members is one? To me at least any other hope and the attempt to achieve unity on any other basis must be vain.

Meanwhile, as strangers and pilgrims seeking the City of God, we are bound to press on upon the lines of a full and frank Modernism, but always with the full confession that the truth we seek is not the life, but that our way and our truth as well as our life will be found in Christ, who promised the spirit of truth to guide us into all the truth.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE SPIRIT

By Geoffrey L. Heawood, M.A., Headmaster of Bromley County School.

THE plain man is living to-day in possibly a greater maze of uncertainty than at any previous period. It is true that the intellectual air seems at times to be clearing, or at any rate it is perhaps easier for us than for our grandfathers to see that all search for truth is one. But even here we have not reached any one triumphant standard of intellectual authority. The pace is hot even for scientific specialists, and the amateur is not infrequently left panting behind looking at trails which seem to lead in widely divergent directions. In morals we are still further from certainty; and what might at times be baffling to an earnest seeker after truth is that, in matters of conduct, professing Christians frequently find themselves in complete disagreement. It was comparatively easy when the World, the Flesh and the Devil, all pretty clearly defined, confronted the Puritan, who could view his life as a clear pilgrimage among foes who dogged his path at every step. Penny Bridge would certainly have been against his code, and sweepstakes; but nowadays we all draw the line at different points.

We are all familiar with the fact that a number of Christian ethical systems, both pre- and post-Reformation, have given guidance for thought and conduct in great detail. To what extent they served their purpose in the era in which each flourished most strongly is no part of my present investigation. But it is worth noting that their legacies are with us and condition our practical problem. A large number of people outside, or very loosely linked to, the Christian Churches hold something very like the Christian conception of God, and live in something resembling the Christian spirit. But when further moral or in-

tellectual demands are crystallized, the apparently homogeneous body breaks up into its component units, or very nearly so. Consequently many of these men and women of goodwill appear to reinforce the possibly equal number who now, as always, have taken refuge in moral stoicism and intellectual agnosticism. A very large number of people are living very fine lives but are unwilling or unable to give a clear lead in a world which is in religious and moral anarchy. We are without authority or without any idea of our course other than a drifting with the main current of decent people.

Perhaps the best starting point is our inherent search for certainty. Man may or may not be a being born to believe, but he is certainly anxious to know. We begin to ask insistent questions in very early childhood, and so long as knowledge is closely and clearly linked to power, we go on asking them. Some of us even go on for the interest of asking questions, and most of us only leave off when the questions seem irrelevant to life around us, or when all seem to lead on to the one insoluble enigma. But even then I believe it to be true that most people are anxious for some sort of certainty. We still seek for signs, though of a different kind from those of Galilee. Agnosticism itself is often, if not usually, dogmatic and anxious for the certainty that knowledge is *not* possible. And everyone knows of the harvest which clever quacks or fraudulent fortune-tellers can reap both from those who are genuinely taken in and from those who consciously indulge themselves in the romantic possibility of really knowing the apparently unknowable.

It is obvious, too, that we cannot live without a quite considerable number of fundamental assumptions. Confidence in the Uniformity of Nature, in the character of the world, in our fellow-men, is essential to any degree of civilized life. But as soon as we begin to examine any of our fundamental assumptions we find ourselves left with a hypothesis or a question mark. It really seems as if we were born with a thirst which was made to be unsatisfied, not merely in the sense of there being always more to know, but in the sense that we cannot *know* anything at all.

For it is probably true to say that there is no satisfactory plain theory of truth—if by truth we mean knowledge of reality.

All our efforts at description in language are aimed at constructing something which will correspond to reality. And language, even if it does not serve merely to conceal our thoughts, is patently inadequate for the purpose. Our highest thoughts break through language and escape, unless perhaps they are imprisoned in poetry. It has been said that it takes two to speak the truth, but it is literally impossible to tell the truth. Words mean slightly different things to each user. Each employment slightly modifies the meaning for the individual, and to no two people does any simple sentence mean exactly the same thing. The individual experience of life has modified or twisted the words.

Of course this is a pardonable exaggeration as far as ordinary life is concerned. Perhaps the very satisfactory service that language renders in ordinary life makes us forget that words are merely symbols—as conventional in their way as the first picture writing; and so the scientist, who as he advances alone must construct further symbols for his own discoveries, is sometimes troubled to find that ordinary men and women take his descriptions all too literally. Our exchange of thoughts, and inevitably our own thinking, is done in symbols of varying adequacy, but none of them more than a rough picture of the idea.

Again, all statements, scientific or historical, are abstractions; they are either definitely and consciously limited, or else they depend for their full truth upon a much wider context which ultimately embraces all time and all space. Historical facts are of this latter nature; and indeed, since everything that occurs is the resultant of all that has gone before and that co-exists with it, a true account would presuppose an account of all — in fact, a history, an account, of the Universe. And since it is rather a drawback to speech to have to do this, we are commonly content with something much less than the whole truth.

But I do not think that it is necessary to labour these theoretical points. Without investigating various philosophic systems, it would probably be agreed that 'truth' as we speak it is a mere approximation. Language is a set of useful symbols, useful when they do not blind our eyes to the fact that they are symbols, and may be mere illusion, albeit very useful illusion. What I am concerned to discover is where for the ordinary man the

basis of authority is. I am taking it that we may assume the possession of logical reasoning, and accurate sense impressions, though possibly 'normal' sense impressions would be a safer term. I assume, that is, that we have got rid of what we may agree to call 'errors'; there still remains the cardinal problem of truth. The problem, I believe, is much the same for all of us: Where can we find certainty, and what sort of certainty can we find?

There are three avenues of approach to Truth, each offering its peculiar assistance and its peculiar danger. It is the *relative* importance, and the precise weight and danger of each, that I would discuss. The three avenues of approach I take to be: (1) Personal experience and intuition; (2) Sense observation systematized into the logical framework of scientific thought; (3) The record of the past, especially the thought and recorded experience of men who have lived before us: in other words, Personal Experience, Science and History.

To take Personal Experience first. In the last resort this must be the ultimate touchstone, though it may lead us in particular circumstances, or in all circumstances, to trust one of the other guides. We may, that is, always ask what people before us have done, and feel impelled to act accordingly; or we may at every turn ask, 'What do the scientists say?' and feel convinced accordingly; but in the last resort it is our personal decision to do either. But this right of private judgment, the legacy of the Greeks and the gift to us of the Renaissance and Reformation, is double-edged. Our conscience is built up of our own past lives, and has been trained and developed by our own thoughts and actions. On the one hand we must follow it, as we have no other ultimate *primary* guide than our own inner light. On the other hand, the psychologists have already discovered enough to make us profoundly distrustful of our own uneducated or partially educated conscience. History is full of dreadful deeds done by religious men at the bidding of conscience. We are not, I must believe, the last word in Evolution. We ought, as imperfect, to follow our own inner light with very great humility.

Psychologically our conscience represents the tug, I believe, of the main drift of our personality, of our will. This main drift, while containing the best that we can live by, will inevitably

have its own individual strengths and weaknesses; besides, it is unfortunately connected with our repressions and compensations. Like ourselves, because it is so intimately ourselves, it has its weaker points and its blind eye. A poor thing, but our own; indeed, the best thing we have, to be guarded at all costs. In one of the most striking metaphors of the New Testament, if the Light which is in us be Darkness, how great is the darkness.

One of the most interesting and arresting religious movements of the present day is based on the deliberate cultivation of this light. It is no new thought. George Fox and Francis of Assisi would, one imagines, have alike subscribed to the central idea of the Groups. All spiritual strength depends largely on two factors, naked sincerity and utter surrender to the best one knows. So far as we recognize our own limitations and do not attempt to judge others or to act as their light, this development is most hopeful for our time. But nothing but harm can come either from the arrogation by any group of individuals to themselves of the monopoly of this search or this surrender, or from failure to recognize the natural psychological bases of our conscience.

The approach to Truth by conscience is, then, the most universal, the most commanding of our acceptance; at once the approach capable of the highest success and the most abject failure.

The second approach is by way of Science. We have come to regard science in a slightly different light during the last quarter-century. It has, possibly, won an even surer place than formerly; but to learn what science pronounces is not to sit down in an easy chair, but to move rapidly. The old confident certainty in the type of method which produced the triumph of Newtonian Physics has gone. Further, the language of Science is recognized as symbolic, a mental construction of what we possibly cannot describe in any other way. We are thus set free on the scientific side, as we have been set free on the religious side, from some of the apparent clashes between science and religion, which were in fact looking at objects from different standpoints, and describing them in different languages. There have been two other most significant developments; one is that whereas twenty years ago popular science lagged twenty years

behind the actual discoveries, and popular philosophies of life ranged themselves accordingly, now every villager can hear on the wireless within a comparatively short time as much as he will ever understand of the progress of current research. The second significant development is that the scientists have turned philosophers and are reflecting on the nature and meaning of the world of which their searchlight has revealed part. This re-marriage of science, philosophy and religion, though it no longer reflects the uniformity of the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas, is clearly most hopeful for the discovery of Truth. Truth may be many-sided, but we must believe her one, and to be reached in some part by any loyal search.

What then are the debits and credits on the scientific balance sheet? On the one hand, we no longer as religious people distrust scientific research in any way, and its conclusions are received with respect. But Science continues; the final picture is not yet; and we have to learn, as it were, to sit in a picture-theatre and be prepared to adapt our thought as the reel unrolls. There is utter necessity for an adaptable mind. Truth does not consist in any fixed picture of the Universe; we have to learn that our picture of God must itself expand as we grow slowly to understand more of the Fatherhood of God. Again, it is always necessary in examining the picture given by scientific research to remember that it is essentially a picture of an abstraction viewed externally. Values and personal experience do not enter into scientific description; indeed, much of the objective value of science lies in this separation. Finally, although some of the finest philosophic reflection has recently come from the pens of scientist-philosophers, it does not follow that a scientist is an expert, or even a good reasoner, outside his own particular branch of knowledge. As scientist he has no more claim to be listened to as a philosopher or theologian than any other man of trained mind, although he has an advantage, not always recognized by the popular Press, over cinema stars and novelists in all matters of import.

We must, then, watch the picture which Science unfolds of the world about it, but always remember that it is a *mental construction of abstract symbols*. The separate symbols can no more *of themselves* make a single coherent picture than all the

king's horses and men could put Humpty-Dumpty together again. On the one hand, Science is our only hope of getting a picture of the Universe about us, and, on the other hand, the picture, which we have made, is something definitely *other* than the Universe of which it is a picture. It may be the truth, and it may be nothing but the truth, but it is certainly not the whole truth.

The third approach is from History. In religion the dead hand of the past has a peculiar power. The reason is not far to seek. Religious practices, for individual and for group, are inevitably largely symbolic. Spiritual truth is handed on through various kinds of sacrament, and in its essentially sacramental character all religion looks back, not forward. And in a religion like Christianity, which is rooted in historical facts, this tendency is very strong.

The authority of the mere past, then, has always, and of its nature is always likely to exercise, more weight in religion than in other attempts at Truth. Yet the content of symbols is different to different generations and even to different individuals; and, most difficult of all, what has by passage of time become verbally false to one generation, was a genuine symbol of spiritual truth to an older. It is a repeated breakdown, which seems to be part of religion, except in so far as minds are kept utterly adaptable and free.

We owe more than we can ever estimate to the social heritage from the past which we enter at birth. All that we learn of Christianity externally comes to us through this social heritage, kept alive through the company of all the Faithful. All truth is handed on, and if we fare further than our fathers, it will be only because they handed on the torch so finely burning as they finished their lap of the race. But we do well if we fare so far. Our social surroundings sometimes over-influence us, often keep us too long in the old paths. As often they prevent the radical moral failure of a people. What claim, then, has the past on our allegiance as an authority in the search for truth?

The first answer inheres in the claim so universally found to be made by the personality of Christ, unique in history. It is, perhaps, less widely recognized that when we are arrested by this Personality our search is only begun. It is a work of the

first importance to disentangle from the evidence of the Four Witnesses the character and balance of His mind and purpose. It has become increasingly recognized lately that historical truth depends on something far greater than the scientific sifting of the evidence, though that is the essential foundation. The imaginative reconstruction, uncertain though this must always be, of the *life* behind the facts is also necessary to history. On this reconstruction, it seems to me, unrelentingly pursued under the leadership of the guides best qualified, depends our certainty. It is a task which each generation must essay afresh, for it is only in our own language and forms of thought that we shall get near to the truth. And when we have done our best we find a clue to the *attitude of mind* in which we can alone attempt to understand the world, a clue to the *spirit* in which to attack our practical duties. We do not find a scientific account of the world, nor even a clear picture; and certainly we do not find an elaborated ethic or any attempt at an exhaustive code of moral injunctions. Yet of the attitude and spirit some would be inclined to say that the life of a Syrian Jew, however lofty, can offer small practical help to the urban society of London, Paris, or New York. It is possibly just here that Christianity has been inclined, in reverence to its Founder, to lose the *balance* of His mind. It is remarkable, when we look at the matter in this light, that so many people have been prepared to reverence Christ's teaching, and His story, without going to the essential religious life of which the story and teaching were the inevitable expression. Within a quarter of a century of His death, Paul was engaged in writing wise and deep practical guidance for his first Christian converts; guidance which we feel to be instinct with the spirit of Christ, although it may not be literally binding on our very different world. But that is the point. 'I think,' said St. Paul, 'that I have the spirit of Christ.' The only ultimate authority lies in that Spirit. And the only certainty for truth lies in the assimilation of that spirit, and its consequent working out in thought and conduct. It is only by participating in the religion which Jesus pioneered (if I may put it so) that we can become qualified to understand the truth of His life and teaching. It is certainly Religion with a capital 'R,' rather than any one religion as we know them at present, that is here meant. But

there, I must believe, lies the authority of history. We have no longer an Infallible Church, or an Infallible Book, but something far harder to discover and interpret, a Spirit indefinitely greater than our fallible minds, but also indefinitely able to permeate them. History is the book of the Spirit and we must learn to read it.

We can find the authority of spirit in all those men and women of the past whose lives make the ultimate appeal to our own spirits. And men of this spirit are the true Church. Interpreted in this sense, the Church is the guardian of all truth reached, the storehouse for ourselves and future ages of the spiritual achievements of the race.

Possibly all this seems to make the task of the plain man immeasurably hard. I am not sure that it is not in just this bracing and stern demand for thought that the hope of the future lies. Religion has too long been considered as a soft option. This has never been the truth, but there has been too much suggestion of it. At the same time it would be a fatal disqualification if we seemed only to consider the intellectual. We certainly can never believe that Jesus was only or even primarily concerned with those whose 'intelligence quotient' was well above 100. But God is greater than our minds, and He has ways of interpreting wisdom to us all, in proportion to our need to use it, provided only that we wait in directness, simplicity, humility and love. Rather, then, than seem to interpret God as a consummate Mathematician (though He must be that and more), or as a supreme Philosopher, I would name God our spiritual Father, the Father of all spirits.

We have, I believe, in our search for truth to be prepared now to live in a frequently changing and symbolic conception of the external world. The cinematograph is the best metaphor which I can muster. External truth, so seen, is relative. And even the most highly skilled scientist is dependent upon other workers in different fields for all but his own small portion of the whole. It will therefore matter less to us that mistakes may be made and assertions modified. It is the development of truth which is fundamental. In our search for the character of the Whole Universe and the nature of the purpose behind it, we must be prepared to make an individual stake. In making our

hypothesis we can follow those whose own assumptions in the past seem to have been justified by their experience of life, who found that their belief made more sense of life, of history and of the universe as then revealed. True, we are dependent upon others for our knowledge, and indeed for our selection of knowledge, of history and of science, and it is therefore that education is a vital factor in modern religious life. The individual hypothesis also depends on the spirit we are of. Our moral tone is bound to colour our general intellectual assumptions. And further, no general hypothesis about the nature of the Universe can be tested solely on abstract intellectual grounds. It must be verified by long personal experience of living it out.

This individual quest may seem to increase rather than decrease our present moral anarchy, but I believe that the way out lies in yet sterner demand for the cultivation of spiritual sensitiveness, and in the willingness of the Christian community to bear in love with considerable breadth of experiment, and to follow without too much misgiving where the Spirit would seem to lead.

BOOK REVIEWS

BISHOP BARNES' GIFFORD LECTURES*

The Bishop of Birmingham's Gifford Lectures, which have for their subtitle 'The World described by Science and its Spiritual Interpretation,' were delivered at Aberdeen in the years 1927—1929. In the revision which they have undergone in the interval between delivery and publication, an account of some of the recent developments of scientific knowledge has been included. They may therefore be regarded as providing a survey, as up-to-date as it is comprehensive, of the modern scientific description of Nature, considered as the background of theological belief. The volume is a substantial one of some seven hundred pages.

In the opening sentences Dr. Barnes states his purpose clearly. The Christian idea of God, which is based on the teaching of Jesus, was regarded by Him as an intuition, to be confirmed by religious experience; but human thought naturally and rightly refuses to be content with such an intuition alone, and seeks to relate the idea with that of God as revealed in nature; for God is the Creator of the Universe as well as the Father of human spirits. It was inevitable that in this theological effort the Jewish cosmology should be used at first, for no other theory of the origin of the world and of men was then available. This cosmology, however, is no longer satisfactory, yet the theological need is as pressing as ever; it therefore becomes our duty to consider what theory of the universe has taken its place, and to relate this in its turn to the God of religious experience. Moreover, the fact that man is himself the outcome of Nature's processes, with faculties all of which are

* *Scientific Theory and Religion.* By Ernest William Barnes (Gifford Lectures at Aberdeen, 1927—1929). (Cambridge University Press. 1933. £1/5/0 net.)

dependent in some measure upon his ancestry and environment, leads us to conclude that his spiritual experience is unreal unless it brings him into touch with the God whose nature is also shown in the universe as a whole.

In fulfilment of this purpose, Lectures II—XVI are occupied with a reasoned account of the modern scientific view of the universe, under the titles Matter, Space, Riemann's General Theory of Space, Space-Time (the special theory of Relativity), General Relativity, The Electrical Theory of Matter, Heat and Light, The Quantum Theory and Röntgen Rays, The Solar System, The Galactic Universe and the Great Nebulae, The Origin of Life and the Geological Record, The Evolution of Plants and Sex, The Evolution of Animals and Mendelism, The Machinery of Evolution, Man's Origin and Past. These fifteen lectures occupy all but 120 pages of the text.

Of the need for conceiving God as at once the God of religious experience and the Source and Sustainer of the Universe there can hardly be any dispute. And we may add another consideration which, from the nature of the case, could not have been elaborated here. It is probable that few theologians of repute could be found to-day who would hesitate for a moment, if they were directly challenged on the point, to declare their acceptance of those main scientific principles, *e.g.* that of biological evolution, which have during the last two generations so profoundly affected our ideas about man and the world he lives in; but none the less it is far rarer than it should be to find in their theological writings the evidence of this changed background to their thinking. The facts have been recognised, as it were, in isolation; they are kept out of the way, where they can be conveniently forgotten; and in consequence language is used on other subjects which would be impossible if the attempt was genuinely being made to bring all facts within the limits of a coherent scheme. The writer once suggested to a group of people proposing to study the doctrine of the Atonement that a useful preliminary would be to read something about star-systems and nebulae. It is, indeed, of real importance that such theological discussions should be carried on, if we may so put it, in the presence of the universe, and not behind closed doors; and although this particular application of the subject could not be handled in Gifford lectures, at least it may be hoped that readers will carry into such studies elsewhere the consciousness of that scientific background with which Dr. Barnes has here made them acquainted.

These considerations, however, do not explain or, in our opinion, justify the particular method of exposition which Dr. Barnes has adopted. It is a method which seems to us inappropriate outside the mathematical or scientific lecture room, and we hope that it will not become the fashion with Gifford lecturers. The Bishop seeks not merely to expound the present position in the different departments of science which have been named above, and to exhibit an outline of the arguments which have been followed in their development, but actually to present these arguments with an amount of detail and technical language and symbol which must make at least one-third of the book unintelligible to the ordinary reader. Sometimes for a score of pages we are conducted through a long chain of mathematical reasoning expressed in symbols which even a mathematician cannot interpret intelligently unless he has had some training in the highly specialised methods of analysis employed in the theories of non-Euclidean geometry or of Relativity. And as the non-specialist reader gazes blankly at page after page of this kind, it is poor comfort to notice, scattered here and there, such words as 'evidently,' 'obviously,' 'it is readily seen,' 'we can easily see,' and the like. The fact that this criticism applies to a large part of almost all the lectures between page 28 and page 410 is the more surprising when we remember that on page 6 we were told that 'these lectures are intended for

educated men and women who have no technical knowledge of science or philosophy. They will therefore, as far as possible, be free from the technical terms to be found in scientific and philosophical discussions.' Moreover, there is a considerable difference between lecturing about the bearing of a particular scientific theory on religion and lecturing in detail on the arguments for the theory itself; and however interesting the latter may be, to provide a platform for it was scarcely the purpose of Lord Gifford.

As the central core of the book is devoted to the presentation of the modern scientific position, theology and philosophy are practically relegated to the last 120 pages. But here and there in the earlier part sentences or short paragraphs occur which express Dr. Barnes' opinions in regard to the theological bearing of his subject. He repeatedly states his conviction that there is need to postulate the working of divine purpose and of creative activity (as distinct from special creative acts) behind the phenomena of nature; and of this creative activity life and mind are the supreme manifestations. The theory of Relativity has made it less, rather than more, difficult to see God's will in the physical realm, but it is to be remembered that any belief in God worth preserving must be founded, not on inanimate nature, but on the moral order. There are realities in the Universe which cannot be classified under energy, momentum, or stress; and if we now interpret matter as in certain respects not different from energy and radiation, this by no means abolishes the distinction between the physical and the psychical, or assures us that materialism is merely obsolete. It is important to know whether space is curved or not, because if space is Riemannian it will be finite, and 'if God's universe is finite we can hope to begin to understand the range of His activity; if it is infinite any such hope must be abandoned.' [But it is not easy to see why, in the latter case, it becomes necessary to abandon even the *hope* that we may some day (say, in twenty million years) *begin* to understand.] The problem of evil is much older than man, and is presented at the earliest stages of the evolution of plant life. The cosmos, he feels, was created to be the basis for the higher forms of consciousness, but this may ultimately be realised in human types of higher development and greater specialisation than exist at present, and man as we know him may prove to have been but an episode in terrestrial evolution. There is reason to believe that life exists throughout the whole cosmos, and that in many places its development has reached stages immeasurably in advance of that attained by man. Life probably occurred originally through spontaneous generation, but if we can suggest a way in which it may have arisen we are no nearer to the understanding of its nature. The extinction of highly specialised forms in the past suggests the possibility—the probability—that man's existence on the earth is doomed to reach an abrupt end. God exists apart from His creation: He is primarily transcendent and possessed of at least such qualities as constitute personality in man.

Dr. Barnes calls attention to the serious difficulty that is constituted for religious faith by the fact that the variations upon which the whole process of evolution is founded are apparently non-moral. Good and bad arise alike. They have led to odious parasitism and microbic diseases, as well as to parental self-sacrifice and the instinct for truth. And the ultimate responsibility for this must rest with God; moreover, the evolutionary process is as clear a revelation of God's creative activity as we can have. Dr. Barnes has no final answer for this difficulty. He insists that we cannot postulate that God resembles the process in being Himself non-moral, and points out that at any rate evolution has produced man with his increasing regard for goodness—man in whom the Christ-spirit has at last appeared. But the dilemma remains, and no escape from it is yet within sight.

It is true that the facts adduced put the problem of evil in a particularly forcible way; yet it is, after all, that ancient problem that they raise, and it is not likely that a solution of the difficulty will be found apart from a general solution of the problem as a whole. But we will venture to make two comments. In the first place, our estimate of physical evil in nature can easily be over-coloured through ideas which are really appropriate only to moral evil among self-conscious beings; and it seems possible that it is through some such action on our part that that particular aspect of the problem which is mentioned here appears to us as more than usually intractable. And secondly, if it be the case that it is in terms of purpose that the cosmos ought in the last resort to be interpreted, then the consideration which Dr. Barnes offers as a partial answer to his dilemma is worth more than he seems disposed to allow. No parasitism or microbic diseases can alter the fact that the processes of nature have actually resulted, not merely in the production of much that is good, but—what is far more important—in a condition of things in which, where morally conscious beings are concerned, evil is known as evil and good is known as good. And if this is the result of evolution working through apparently non-moral variations, it seems to be implied that the process is not after all so unethical as it seems, and that the contrast between a moral Creator and a non-moral process of creation is only—shall we say?—a first approximation to the truth. And to urge this is not merely to fall back on a faith otherwise established, but it is to try to see evolution steadily and to see it whole.

The last four lectures bear the titles: Scientific Theory and the 'Real' World, God and our Belief in His Existence, Religious Experience, and Immortality. From the first of these we learn the Bishop's philosophical position: he describes it as moderate realism (objects exist independently of finite minds, but they cannot exist outside the subject-object relation; therefore they exist in God, the Universal Mind). In relation to the problem of consciousness, he rejects any doctrine of psychophysical parallelism, and asserts the psychical and the physical to be two aspects of some unknown unity. The freedom of the will is acknowledged, and consequently a difficulty arises as to how the physical side of the unknown unity can be deterministic; to this the only answer at present available is that our experimental science, which affords no evidence of interference from the psychical side, must be in error. (The statement that experimental science affords no evidence to show that a mental decision has any effect in the physical cosmos will cause surprise to most readers.) In regard to the interpretation of scientific theories, he accepts the phenomenalist position.

Belief in God is justified (apart from the philosophical argument referred to in the last paragraph) partly by the evidence which nature supplies of purpose due to a Creative mind. But even more it is founded on our sense of moral values. These, by their very nature, claim objective validity, and this can be only if they have their source in God. Goodness, beauty and truth are attributes of God. In so far as this conception of God is taken over into the scientific picture presented in the earlier lectures, even if it is only to emphasise the difficulty arising out of the apparent cruelty of nature, it would seem that we have a religious criticism of the doctrines of science rather than a scientific criticism of the doctrines of religion. If so, it is important and interesting to note that, where the witness of religion and the witness of science appear to be opposed, the Bishop takes his stand by the former.

This is particularly noticeable in the final lecture on Immortality. All the evidence of science points to the improbability of the soul or self surviving the dissolution of the body. Our belief in immortality stands or falls

with our belief in a God whose purpose is Good. And if we do indeed believe in such a God, then the belief in immortality is justified. 'Under the conditions of existence known to us, personality cannot be severed from the whole complex organism. Now we can, of course, give free rein to fancy and imagine that after bodily death the personality that has been created during life will receive an appropriate tabernacle . . . The biologist will demur to any such play of fancy and point out that continuity of personal life seems inseparable from continuity alike of organism and environment. But our belief in personal immortality is not the consequence of the knowledge given by natural science: it results from facts of the moral consciousness and from our belief in the rationality of the Universe.'

So we close our account of this important volume. It is a work of wide range in its scientific knowledge, as was to be expected, and, apart from the overloading with technical and sometimes (to the plain reader) unintelligible detail to which we have already referred, it will be read and studied with great interest and profit. The importance of bringing religion into intelligent and sympathetic relation with the discoveries of science is very great, and no one is likely to read Dr. Barnes' lectures without having his outlook widened and his mind fascinated by investigations of which perhaps his religious beliefs have previously taken little account. Our chief criticism is that, throughout the scientific section of the book, the religious interest seldom appears above the horizon, while in the later lectures, where that interest predominates, the conclusions owe much less than one would expect to what has preceded. Not the least interesting thing is the indication which the lectures afford that, where they appear to conflict, even the duty of accepting loyally and enthusiastically the teaching of science is not so imperative in Dr. Barnes' mind as that of trusting the goodness of God.

C. F. Russell.

A ROAD TO ROME*

The secession to the Church of Rome of a justly respected and noted Free Church minister is bound to be of interest, but that interest is strengthened when the minister has for many years adopted the full round of Roman doctrine and practice. Dr. Orchard occupied for long a place unique in organised Christianity. His advocacy of 'Free Catholicism' gave an entirely new view of that freedom of which the Free Churches have so long boasted, and there will be many who did not know Dr. Orchard as preacher and pastor who will nevertheless turn to his *apologia* to learn the reasons which led him to sacrifice the place of eminence which he had earned for himself in the religious life of London and to seek a shelter within the Roman communion.

Dr. Orchard commences his story by telling of his early days as a clerk in a London railway office and of his conversion at a mission held in connection with the Presbyterian Church, which he had been brought up to attend. Feeling that his life's work lay in the ministry, he embarked upon a scheme of laborious self-education and finally graduated at London University after a period of study at Westminster College, Cambridge. The early years of his ministry were those of the New Theology campaign preached by Dr. R. J. Campbell, and it was into the work of this campaign that Dr. Orchard entered. But the New Theology lacked any secure basis, the vague monism upon which it was built being little more than a perverted sacramentalism, and soon both Dr. Campbell and Dr. Orchard turned their thoughts elsewhere. Even in his New Theology days, Dr. Orchard had vague catholic leanings, and with his adoption of orthodox

* *From Faith to Faith—An Autobiography of Religious Development.* By W. E. Orchard, D.D. (Putnam, 1933. 7/6).

Nicene Christology these came to the fore. At the same time, the War had a profound effect upon his thinking. His socialist and pacifist outlook became intensified, and just as the War convinced him of the need for an international state, so too it convinced him of the need for an international church. From henceforth his thoughts were turned to the great question of reunion.

With the study of the reunion question, Dr. Orchard's mind turned towards Rome. He adopted Roman ceremonial and doctrine. He even went so far as to receive orders from an obscure Nestorian. But in following out this programme he had in reality isolated himself. To Roman and Anglo-Catholics, he was, for all his catholicity, a dissenter still, whilst to others he seemed to be lost as far as any type of Protestantism was concerned. In reality, he had placed himself in a position completely false. His Catholicism lacked any roots in history, and the few ministers who joined with him in 'The Society of Free Catholics' fell away as Dr. Orchard moved further and further upon the road to Rome, while his own immediate following was built up more upon his abilities as a preacher than upon any inherent sympathy with his Catholicism. Finally the position of isolation became intolerable to Dr. Orchard; negotiations for reunion with the Church of England broke down; and he resigned his pastorate, quietly left the King's Weigh House Church for the Continent, and in June, 1932, was received into the Church of Rome.

Here Dr. Orchard concludes his story, and he devotes the second part of his book in seeking to persuade others to follow him in the step which he himself has taken. Of his sincerity there can be no doubt, but his arguments are far from convincing or rather will convince only those anxious to be convinced. The question of authority looms large. If one accepts the view that Christ founded a Church in the Roman sense of the term and that Rome is the inevitable centre of a visible unity which He would wish for it, then it is a very short step to accept the Papal claims. One feels inclined to question not only whether Dr. Orchard has neglected a study of Protestant writers upon the Roman controversy but also whether he has even given any serious consideration to the writings of the Reformers themselves. Point after point which he brings forward was considered and answered by such an author as Bishop Jewel in the sixteenth century.

One leaves this book with a query, not concerning the Papal claims, for Dr. Orchard has made it abundantly clear, as did Newman before him, that it is personal temperament and the problem of authority which drives him to Rome, but a query concerning Dr. Orchard himself. Although he has long abandoned the Biblical criticism of his New Theology days, yet his intellectual processes have been formed along the lines of private judgment and are therefore 'Modernist' in Roman eyes; and he has been forced to take the anti-Modernist oath. He has long been the lonliest preacher in Christendom; yet his fellow-ministers in the Congregational Union have been his brethren in the ministry of the Church. He is forced to stigmatize them as heretics and schismatics and to 'abjure' the King's Weigh House Church which it nearly broke his heart to leave after a ministry of eighteen years. Is he a less lonely man now that he has entered the fold of Rome?

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.

A SHORT BIBLE*

Our greatly increased knowledge of the Bible and the consequent readjustment of our attitude towards it have had the temporary effect of discouraging 'the plain man' from the reading of *The Book*. He has gathered,

* *A Short Bible*. Chosen and arranged by V. J. K. Brook, A. A. David, W. H. Fyfe and A. E. Lynam, with explanations by J. S. Bezzant. (Blackwell, Oxford. 1933. 7/6.)

vaguely, 'the Bible is not true,' or at least has felt he does not know where he is with it. Teachers also have felt the difficulty. To meet this situation there have been innumerable small commentaries, but the number of laymen who will use even a one-volume commentary is not large. There have also been Children's Bibles, giving extracts suitable for the young. *A Short Bible with Explanations* meets the need of 'the plain man' and of the teacher better than any book so far available. There are three parts to this well-printed and handy volume: (1) 165 passages from the Old Testament, taking up 348 pages; (2) 185 passages from the New Testament, taking up 220 pages; (3) *Explanations* of all these passages by Canon Bezzant, taking up 374 pages. The passages are in the Authorized Version, with paragraphs but without verses. The traditional order of the books is retained, except in the case of the Synoptic Gospels from which extracts are combined into a single sequence of narrative. There is occasional discreet omission within a passage: in this way we have the 'whole' story of Ruth and of Esther. Most of the Old Testament passages are of the historical or prophetic type, and a few will regret the absence of passages illustrative of the Jewish ceremonial law. In the New Testament St. Matthew, Chap. i, is not quoted, and St. Luke i, 34, is omitted from the story of the Annunciation; this omission is balanced, however, by Canon Bezzant's discussion of the text — and of the Virgin Birth — in his *Explanations*. The aim of the selectors has been 'the passages of religious value and literary beauty which most deserve to be familiar and which are likely to be found useful in teaching the young.' The number of passages—350 in all—permits the inclusion of nearly all those most valued, and, while everyone will find omissions they regret—mine are Psalm cxxxix, Philemon, and Revelation vii—the selection is worthy of the highest praise. In the Old Testament there are eighty-six stories from the historical books from Genesis to Esther, six passages from Job, twenty-four Psalms, thirty-six well-chosen passages from the Prophets, and five from the Apocrypha, and a few others. In the New Testament the story of Jesus is told in 118 passages from the Synoptics and nineteen from St. John; these are followed by twenty-five from Acts, nineteen from the Epistles, and four from Revelations. Each passage has a descriptive title which is happily selected, except in the case of the two Jonah passages, where the title calls attention to the miraculous instead of to the missionary element in the book.

Canon Bezzant has performed a difficult task with great efficiency. He writes briefly of the authorship and date of the books of the Bible, as they occur, and gives a general introductory note to groups of passages. After that, he gives a few comments on the text, elucidating its meaning and suggesting its historical context. Occasionally he offers reflections of a general character. He usually contents himself with giving a view of the passage widely accepted by modern scholars while, quite rightly in such a book, not burdening his notes with references to his authorities. On minor matters he is commendably dogmatic: on points of high controversy he states shortly the pros and cons. Canon Bezzant has a useful eye for the sort of question the passage may provoke in thoughtful young people.

This book will be useful to clergy and teachers who have to speak often at short notice on Biblical passages; it will suggest, if need be, a worthy subject, and the *Explanations* will remind the clergy of their Biblical knowledge, and add to it. But we would especially commend *A Short Bible* to the many Churchmen who are not now very regular readers of the Bible. They will find here the passages which have attracted them most and some they will learn to love: the *Explanations* will probably tell them what they want to know and deepen their understanding of what they read.

H. G. MULLINER.

THE SECRET LORE OF INDIA*

This book is a presentation of the main passages from the Upanishads and a comparison of their teaching with Christianity as defined by Bishop Westcott as 'the One Perfect Life.' In the Introduction an outline is given of the Sacred Tradition of the Aryans reaching its climax in the Secret Lore. This lore was produced by the Men of the Spirit, who about the middle of the first millenium B.C. in reaction from sacrificial magic withdrew into the forest to meditate upon the true nature of Reality. Their meditation was a progressive interpretation of Reality in terms of the Self. The teaching is particularly clever in the work of Yagnavalkya. He taught that 'Self is Being.' The author writes: 'It is this One Person who is the Self in each man and the Self of the World. There are not two Selves, one human, the other cosmic, but only One Self. Out of the One Self all proceeds, and it is on account of having the One Self as their inner thread that all things have their being and movement.' 'Here, then, is the glory of the Self, the Final Step (the seventh as we have counted the stages, in the path of escape from the Magic and Acquisitive Ritual), the harbour of security and inner contentment, reached at last, the great Classic Doctrine of the Upanishads' (p. 40). Salvation was to be found in the knowledge of 'the true Dignity of the Self.' This saving knowledge, it was first thought, could be attained 'if only one was possessed of sufficient intelligence and diligence in his thinking.' But later it was believed that salvation was a gift which we could not appropriate by taking thought. This later view is present in the lines:

'The Effortless, the creature sees
And lo! thereat his sorrow flees;
The greatness of the Self descries,
Made manifest before his eyes
By the Implanters' favour kind,
To him thus graciously inclined.'

In the concluding section of the book on 'The One Perfect Life for All,' the author does not 'wish to assert that Westcott would have given a complete consent to Upanishad teaching' (p. 232), but claims that his definition of Christianity helps towards a just appreciation of the teaching of the Secret Lore. It is true both Christianity and the Upanishads know the experiences of the soul. Both recognise a desire for a peace which passeth all understanding. Both believe that such peace is realized in some sort of communion or identity with One God. Both believe that this blissful state is attained by some sort of a rising to our true selfhood. And the Christian believes that the True Self was seen in Christ. But there are great differences also. 'For these Eastern Sages the Self is "alepta" (unattaching and unattached) and to such an extent that it is indifferent to good as well as to evil' (p. 240). So there is not with these Forest Philosophers 'the Word that was with God and was God,' becoming 'flesh'; not the taking of the manhood into God, as the Athenasian Creed puts it. There is no Incarnation (p. 241). 'We are to remember that there runs throughout the teaching of the Forest Fathers the strange and subversive doctrine that the highest condition of the Self is a condition of such thorough passivity that it is indifferent to either the good or the evil that it does' (p. 184). This has been called 'the danger line of Upanishad ethics.'

The book is a fascinating and erudite study, and shows that these early and isolated thinkers were becoming aware that there is no explanation in

* *The Secret Lore of India.* By W. M. Teape, M.A. (W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd, 1932. Price 12/6).

terms of the impersonal. They are not as advanced as their Hebrew contemporaries in their view of the moral nature of God, but they are in the process of making an heroic attempt towards a more spiritual interpretation of their experience. If the human mind is essentially similar in all men, lack of understanding between East and West must be accidental, not essential. 'So here is not strife but a recognition of fellow-seekers after Truth.'

G. F. Woods.

HELP WITH A PARISH PROBLEM*

One of the Minor Prophets in picturing the New Jerusalem found a place for the boys and girls 'playing in the streets.' That may be all right for the Golden City, but in this world the streets are not the best inducement to the right use of leisure; and those who have the cause of youth at heart try to provide counter-attractions. Charles E. B. Russell was one of those who spent their lives in this cause. Lads' clubs were not so much his hobby as his purpose in life. He knew their difficulties as well as their joys from A to Z, and his knowledge was based not on untested theory but on hard-won experience gained through many years of devoted labour. To read of his Lads' Club at Heyrod Street, Ancoats, is like reading of the activities of a well-organised school: you pass from gymnastics to recreative classes, a commercial course, a technical course and a dozen different sections of a general course, and, after reading further of a library, an ambulance class and a dozen football teams, it is difficult to realise that the account is of a club which concerned itself with the spare time of ordinary working lads. Yet there was a time in the history even of that club when our membership was small, conditions were cramped, buildings were out of date and the immediate task ahead was that of raising money.

The present book by Russell enabled him before his death in 1917 to bring his long and varied experience into a form which would benefit others who sought to organize and manage lads' clubs. His work has here been revised very considerably and brought up to date by his wife, and is of first-class importance for all who have anything to do with work among youth. Obviously, Russell wrote chiefly for the guidance of those who have the management of the large, undenominational clubs which are doing an increasingly important work in our populous cities. But there is plenty of food for thought in his book for those who have the responsibility of running smaller clubs — and what clergy have not to-day?

There are twenty-three chapters altogether, and they deal with Finance, Discipline, Outdoor and Indoor Games, Gymnasia, Education and so on; and there is something in every one of the chapters which we would like to quote. Russell's ideal for a club was a comprehensive one which included recreation, education and religion, and for him no club was complete which neglected any one of these sides. 'The club which has recruited its boys by the lure of games and athletics must use these only as one method among many of training them to manhood. Gymnastics will pall as years go on, football and cricket and running will lose their charm, and the man of thirty may be left with all his old pleasures gone and nothing of any value to replace them' (p. 86). This quotation occurs in the chapter on outdoor games, and it illustrates the fact that there is a fine religious spirit running through the book, relating discipline and games and camp life to religion in the search for truth, beauty and goodness. And in the chapter on religion, there is an interesting section on 'What is a boy's religion?' which shows how well Russell understood youth in all of its moods. Incidentally, a foot-

**Lads' Clubs.* By C. E. B. Russell and L. M. Russell. (A. & C. Black. 1933. Price 5/-.)

note in that chapter recommends the twelve penny M.C.U. booklets on 'What we Believe' as suitable for study-groups in Clubs.

Those who believe that religion has nothing to do with social activities will do well to leave this book alone; the rest will find in it both inspiration and constructive advice. J. P. HODGES.

FORM-CRITICISM*

Professor Taylor's new work on the ever-interesting subject of the beginnings of the Christian Gospel is a published series of lectures given in the University of Leeds in 1932. It embodies much recent British, American and especially German research, and is very largely concerned with what has come to be known as 'Form-criticism.' This has attracted too little attention in this country, although those who know Rawlinson's 'St. Mark' and Manson's splendid book on the 'Teaching of Jesus' will recall their references to it and the use that was made of certain features in it. The first lectures gives an account of the most recent work in criticism of the Gospels, notably Streeter's 'Four Document' hypothesis and that of 'Proto-Luke,' both of which Taylor thinks will yet stand. Then he turns to the study of the 'Formgeschichtliche' School. This method of criticism seeks to penetrate to the very earliest moments of the Gospel. 'It is primarily concerned with the oral period . . . The basic assumption is that during this period the tradition circulated mainly in separate oral units which may be classified according to their forms' (p. 10). This method of criticism dates from 1919, when Dibelius of Heidelberg suggested that the writers of the Gospels were 'collectors of units of tradition existing in free circulation.' In 1921 Bultmann went much further by putting forward the view that it was the community which largely formed the sayings attributed to Jesus, although, as Taylor says elsewhere, this seems to disallow the existence and the evidence of the many eye-witnesses there must have been in the first generation. The value of Form-criticism is 'that it helps us to penetrate the hinterland of the decades from 30 A.D. to 50 A.D., and to place ourselves in imagination among the young Palestinian communities . . . we are permitted still to be ear-witnesses, to hear the disciples of Jesus and through them Jesus Himself' (p. 21).

Form-criticism proceeds along these lines. It classifies the material, and distinguishes between the narrative and the sayings, and then tries to find the original form of the material in the oral period and to envisage the 'life-situation' out of which it arose. It might be urged that this is a subjective method, but it is surely no more so than any scientific hypothesis which is an imaginative leap, but tested by rational proofs and checked by results. The trouble with most German criticism is the tendency to make everything fit, and let the imagination run away with the facts, but Dr. Taylor does not fall into that error, and it would be foolish to reject Form-criticism on the ground of subjectivity. For instance, Taylor allows the definite sweep and movement of Mark to suggest that is represents a genuine chronology, and not merely a collection of scraps and stories. He thinks (p. 40) that Mark had access to a good tradition concerning the public ministry of Jesus. The idea of the 'Church traditions,' with which we are familiar in Streeter, is used a good deal in this method of criticism, and the view is put forward that there were at least three Passion narratives, Matthew alone relying entirely on Mark for his narrative. Why are the Passion stories so complete and those of the Resurrection so scrappy? The 'life-situation' was different, for men wished to hear all about the former, but the fact of the

* *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition.* By Vincent Taylor, D.D. (Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1933. 7/6 net.)

latter was so obvious to them that they were satisfied to hear any single account of an appearance from any who had witnessed one. For such isolated accounts were used by Luke. Again, the early community had to meet problems of religious or moral importance, *e.g.* of Sabbath observance, divorce, taxes, traditions. Hence arose 'Pronouncement Stories,' which showed how Jesus dealt with these questions.

Why was it that the early church was not interested in biography, and content with a narrative we consider so scanty? Dr. Taylor thinks that it was due to the fact that the Apostles were not literary men, that their interest was more in questions of life and behaviour than of historical events, and that they looked for the return of Christ. There is a discussion on the Virgin Birth, which is affirmed to be a continuous narrative and an obvious compilation. 'It ought to be treated as inspired poetry rather than as sober prose' (p. 160). 'They (the Birth stories) represent the Evangelist's attempt to express in a poetic and imaginative form definite convictions about the birth and divine significance of Jesus.' The author believes that neither critics nor theologians seem willing to meet squarely the problem of the Virgin Birth. Hence so much uncertainty in the minds of Christians, but 'the truth is, there is not, and cannot be, a completely scientific judgment on this question, if we have regard to all the facts of the case. Where the Virgin Birth is accepted, it is held mainly because it is found in Scripture and in the great Creeds of the Church. If, in these circumstances, I may venture an opinion, it is that the New Testament evidence is so scanty and so late that increased acceptance is likely to be given as time goes by to the position held by the late Canon Sanday, who accepted the Supernatural Birth of Jesus, but interpreted the Virgin Birth symbolically' (p. 162).

In conclusion, one can see how the Gospels emerged quite naturally from the reminiscences of eye-witnesses, from the common and shared recollections of people meeting each other and visiting from community to community in the earliest days of the Church; how questions were raised and answered, and how the material tended to be cherished and selected along lines that would meet the particular situation. The Gospels arose first to meet practical needs, and they reflect this. Not until the second generation did the need for an orderly compilation arise, and it was then that the Gospels as we know them came to be. The great merit of Dr. Taylor's book seems to be that it makes this process appear so reasonable and clear, and one cannot doubt that it is a valuable contribution to scholarship, and a work which will fully repay study and thought from all who care for the truth, and welcome the new light which criticism can shed upon the story of Christ in the Gospels.

MARCUS KNIGHT.

CORRESPONDENCE

AN UNSENTIMENTAL CHRISTOLOGY.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

May I venture to express some thoughts on the subject with which the Rev. G. J. Shebbeare deals, from a lay point of view. We often make our problems by attempt at definition on matters beyond our present knowledge. A young child was given by her mother some instruction on the doctrine of the Trinity. 'Do you understand, dear?' asked the parent. 'Mother, I think I should if you would not try to explain,' replied the child. We need more of the wisdom of the child.

The claim of Our Lord to pre-existence becomes more intelligible if we remember that Humanity has a Divine heredity. If we accept as true St. Paul's statement that human spirits are the 'offspring of God,' that 'in Him we live and more and have our being,' then we recognize that pre-existence is true of all spirits—that we did not begin to be at birth, although we have no recollection of our past state, and do not claim that our existence was then a *personal* one or involves memory.

The majority are quite unconscious now of this divine heredity; their consciousness is entirely mundane, but a few have glimpses of the Eternal State and feel that they belong to it. Jesus, the perfect man, was no doubt profoundly conscious of His intimate relationship to God, His Father, and realised that He shared in the full life of the Eternal Being, that the Glory of God, both before His incarnation and forever, was His glory too. 'Before Abraham became I am' need not imply human *memory* of the pre-natal condition, but intuitive perception of the *union* of His Spirit with God's Spirit: He knew that He came forth from the Father and was the pleroma, *i.e.* the filled receptacle of God.

Whilst most men think in conditions of time, He *felt* in eternal conditions. The true glory of union with God He desired that others should share, for He and they are 'all of one' (*Heb.* ii), but whereas in His experience it was instinctive, with most of us it is clouded and obscured by our undeveloped state and our earth-bound consciousness. He was fully developed; we are only half grown.

H. A. DALLAS.

NEWMAN'S 'EFFEMINACY.'

SIR,

May I point out the full bearing of Mr. Micklewright's admirable and restrained article on 'The Legend of Newman'? Newman was homosexual, as were his special friends, and as are many who have followed his example since.

Psychologists and psycho-analysts are now familiar with this peculiarity. In the case of a man of Newman's physical constitution, the homosexual temperament meant not only a certain want of manliness but also a definite strain of inhumanity. The characters of less moral individuals can be studied in many modern examples, from Oscar Wilde and others who became Roman Catholics, down to well-known contemporary instances.

Newman, with all his goodness and conscientiousness, had this psychological defect; and the virile Charles Kingsley instinctively felt the antagonism, though in his day the matter was not understood. At the present time it is important that we should realize the attraction which Romanism possesses for persons of this type.

A. W. Hutton's reminiscences in the *Expositor* for 1890 reveal, perhaps unconsciously, many details of peculiar interest to the psycho-analyst.

E.B.

MODERNISM AND ITS FUTURE.

SIR,

For most of us the way of Modernism is made hard by its opponents. Some of us fear that it will be made unnecessarily harder by your publication of Canon Palmer's letter in the May number of the *Modern Churchman.*

We who accept office as 'Ministers of the New Testament' may be charged fairly with grievous disloyalty if we allow ourselves to use terms like the Church's 'shaky shelters,' or to propound that 'the world will not need ecclesiastical organization to keep the Christian spirit alive.' That

goes far beyond Dean Inge's 'The *less*, perhaps, will the power of the Church become.' Again, 'one object of a good educator is to make himself unnecessary';—to pupils just going down, possibly; not to those coming up next term, surely?

In some articles in the *Modern Churchman* there has been sounded the note that perhaps one object of Christ is to make Himself unnecessary; that a time may come when the Gospel records and historical accounts of things done by Christ through His Church will be dissolved in the advancing tides of spiritual progress; that sacramental worship and faith in its value will no longer exist.

If Modernism should incorporate such views into the main body of its programmes it may defeat its purpose of advancing *true* change. There is in these views that which is opposed most patently to New Testament teaching, and faith and hope. If some future generation should need neither Christ nor His Church for educator, then Christianity will have become indeed 'a creed outworn.' A 'universal Christian spirit' is very far from being the same thing in essence as the personal Christ abiding in our spirit by the aid of His sacramental and other grace; and guiding us into all truth by His Presence, which is the main New Testament theme.

The article by Alfred Darby in your March number on 'Christ Universal' has no such iconoclastic proposals. 'The mind of Christ must appear in all its (the Church's) activities,' p. 693. 'He retains His pre-eminence,' p. 695. 'The disciple turns for guidance to the person of the Lord,' p. 696. 'It is because this (spirit of Christ) is a possible possession of every man that Jesus is the Saviour and Lord of the world.'

We who are tentative Modernists would feel bound to abandon the cause if views like Canon Palmer's are accepted as stones fitted for the edifying of the body of Christ.

THOMAS COOPER (M.A. Oxon).

Moseley, Birmingham.
May 24th, 1933.

Canon Palmer writes in reply:

My meaning will, I hope, be elucidated by the following quotations:—

'In casting away the old trammels of socrosanct authority, we are carving for ourselves and for those who shall come after us a great Emancipation. The sordid and often disgraceful records of ecclesiastical politics no longer concern us. The glorious church of which S. Paul dreamed once more floats before our imagination, and it inspires the hopes of F. A. Robertson, of Brighton. There is a church larger than the limits of the church visible, larger than Jew or Christian or the Apostle Peter ever dreamed, larger than our narrow hearts dare to hope for even now. The open vision is granted to all and every nation who fear God and work righteousness, to all in other words who live devoutly towards God and by love towards man' (Dean Inge's Presidential Address).

We may rejoice as Modernists in the Christian ideal, set forth by Bishop Lightfoot, 'a holy season extending the whole year round, a temple confined only by the limits of the habitable world, a priesthood co-extensive with the human race.' Far better this than to hold to the doctrine of the undated Greek hymn (No. 352), which bids us rejoice

'That still the holy Church is here,
Although her Lord is gone.'